

The Southern Speech Journal

VOLUME XXIII

WINTER, 1957

NUMBER 2

THE SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

PART IV. THE FORENSIC TOURNAMENT

DALLAS C. DICKEY

NO HISTORY of the Southern Speech Association is complete without space being allotted to its forensic tournament. Immediately there comes to mind the long history of the tournament. From the time of the second convention in 1931, the forensic tournament has been continued. Even in 1935 when the Association did not hold its annual spring convention but met in December, 1934, with the national association in New Orleans, the Southern tournament was held in the spring at Spartanburg, South Carolina. Actually the only time a tournament was not held after 1931 was in 1945 when, due to wartime restrictions, no Association convention was held. In other words, the tournament has been part and parcel of the total activities of the convention week which, for many years, has been the first "full week" of April.

Also, the tournament has been the means of enabling numerous people to attend the conventions and to participate in them. Since the earliest days of the Association schools were urged, in planning

This is the fourth in a series of five articles on the history of the Southern Speech Association which are appearing in the Journal in connection with the Association's twenty-fifth anniversary. The first article, "The Southern Speech Association: Founding and First Two Years," was published in the Spring, 1956, issue. The second on "The Association, 1932-1946," was published in the Fall, 1956, issue. The third article which covered the years from 1946 to the Memphis silver anniversary convention was published in the Fall, 1957 issue. The fifth article, which will appear in the immediate future, will treat the history of The Southern Speech Journal.

Mr. Dickey (Ph.D., Louisiana State, 1938) was professor of speech at the University of Florida, and chairman of the committee charged with collecting the archives and historical holdings of the Association, and producing this history.

their forensics programs, to include the Southern Association tournament as perhaps the Number One item on their forensic calendars. In this way the coach or director would be able to attend the convention while his students participated in the tournament. There is no way of knowing how many faculty members have been privileged to attend the conventions and to become active in the Southern Association because of the tournament, but that many have been the beneficiaries, there can be no doubt.

Moreover, the financial well-being of the Association has been protected and enhanced tremendously over the years because of the tournament. This fact may be unknown to some. Others, who are aware of it, may not be as appreciative of it as they should be. Year in and year out, there has been no more stable source of income than that afforded by the tournament. Stated in another way, those schools which have supported the tournament have been of greater service in protecting the solvency of the Association than those which have not attended. By the simple expedient of levying moderate fees on each debate team entered, on each contestant in the individual events, on each representative in the Congress of Human Relations, and by requiring that each coach or director be a paid member of the Association in good standing, the substantial sum of \$200.00 to \$400.00 annually subsidizes the Association. The financial obligations upon any school entering participants have not been oppressive, and cumulatively the Association has benefitted enormously. Recognition of the simple fact that schools inevitably spend money on their forensics programs motivated leaders in the Association to advocate that support of the Southern Association tournament is fully justified.

Finally, a certain idealism and progressive thinking has characterized the forensic tournament as attempts have been made to achieve better educational objectives than are often associated with many other tournaments. Real efforts have been made to make the Southern tournament a different kind of experience for the students. In a very real sense, it has been an experimental tournament in which different kinds of events have been sponsored, and in which different methods of judging and evaluation have been undertaken. The tournament procedure has been altered and modified from year to year, so that the static has been counteracted. Students and faculty have shared reactions. In certain years debate questions other than the national topics have been used to add variety.

Some of the debate propositions have been ones of special concern to the people of the South. Also, the variety of individual speaking contests has permitted wholesome competition, and the practice of having the finalists in after-dinner speaking compete in a final contest at the banquet ending the tournament has permitted all attending to enjoy an evening of "light-touch" speaking. The banquet has become one of the fine traditions of the Association itself.

The values and benefits of the tournament might well be extended. All the tangible and intangible returns are difficult to enumerate or assess. But since the tournament has been carefully supervised each year by the Executive Council of the Association, much thought has been given to how it should be conducted, what events should be included, what events should have greater support than others, and what ones should be encouraged and what ones do not deserve approval or continuance. In a quarter of a century untold numbers of students from all over the South have participated. Memories of the events inevitably become lifelong and numerous friendships have been generated. A roll call of students who have attended the tournament would reveal the names of now prominent professional and political leaders all over the South.

The mechanics of the tournament have been worked out over the years, partly by provisions in the Constitution of the Association, but also in large part by the decisions of policy by the Executive Council. After the lapse of a few years, it was specified in the Constitution that the third vice-president of the Association should be charged with the responsibilities of the tournament. Hence, careful thought has always been given by the nominating committee to the problem of naming this person. The third vice-president in charge of the tournament has been selected, therefore, for his willingness to assume work and responsibilities, for getting out all information in plenty of time, for the scheduling of the tournament events, for a careful tabulation of the results for the Association and for the schools attending, for collecting all registration fees, and for a complete report to the Executive Council as well as the Association. Such responsibilities have not been casual ones, with the result that an untold number of hours of labor have been given the cause of the tournament and the welfare of the Association as well. While it is impossible to mention all who have given up their time and energy to administer the tournament, certain individuals

in the first twenty-five history of the Association deserve mention. One is Glenn Capp of Baylor University who, particularly in the late 1930's, served for several years in succession. Charles McGlon carried the load for two years, as did Batsell Baxter and Frank Davis in more recent years. Significantly, all the above named individuals were in time advanced to the presidency of the Association—an honor which all richly deserved.

Administratively, the tournament has had an interestingly history. In the first two or three years of the Association, it was really part and parcel of the conventions themselves. In the earliest convention programs, the forensic tournament ran concurrent with the conventions. The rounds of debate and the various individual contests were actually scheduled between professional session, so that people attending the conventions were free to attend the events and to act as judges for them. Within a short time, however, this procedure proved unacceptable, and the Executive Council took action to declare that all the forensic contests must be concluded before the start of the convention.

By this decision the events of the convention week have come to be established. For many years, then, the forensic tournament was held on Tuesday and Wednesday, with the convention scheduled for Thursday and Friday. Over the course of the years, however, especially because more events have been added, it has been necessary to begin the tournament on Monday. Thus, until the final banquet on Wednesday night, which features the finalists in after-dinner speaking, the forensic directors are always busily employed in administering the tournament and in judging and evaluating the contests and the contestants.

Central in the forensic tournament have been the debates. The pattern developed has been six rounds of round-robin debating with divisions designated as Senior College Men, Senior College Women, and Junior College (open to both men and women who are freshmen or sophomores), and High School. The debates are judged by the coaches who also act as critics. Also, especially in more recent years, the judges have rated the individual debaters so that in the final picture awards and recognition may be given to individuals as well as the debate teams. The deemphasis on tournament winners or champions, and the recognition of individual speakers according to the standards of Superior, Excellent, Good, and Fair, has been ad-

hered to increasingly in recent years. The questions debated over the years have, for the most part, been the national debate topics, but at times, particularly in earlier years, different propositions were used. Also, considerable experimentation has taken place. For example, in certain early years one round of Oregon style debating (cross-questioning) was scheduled. Also, on occasion experiments have been tried with the direct clash method. Generally, however, the conventional procedures in debate have been followed with close attention being given to encouragement of good debating and to severe indictment of debating which reveals methods and traits that critics cannot approve as being the goals and objectives of the best.

In the tournament numerous individual contests have been sponsored over the years, such as after-dinner speaking, extemporaneous speaking, original oratory, poetry readings, etc. These individual contests have always been scheduled so as to permit debaters to take part in them even though schools are often represented by students not members of the debating teams. Again, as in the debate tournament, although winners of the contests have been announced, in more recent years especially the practice has been to rate the speakers as Superior, Excellent, Good, etc., and winning has been considered of less importance than the quality of speaking that can be developed in the various participants. By setting critical standards, and by encouraging carefully selected judges to give the students the benefit of their criticisms, better educational objectives have been sought.

While the forensic tournament is always finished by Wednesday evening of the convention week, another Association-sponsored event comes within the purview of the student activities. This is the Congress of Human Relation of the Southern Speech Association. Begun at the Atlanta convention in 1938, it has been continued ever since. Its history and structure deserve recounting.

In the late 1930's various coaches and directors felt the need of some student training program over and above that provided in the tournament. Also, a very practical problem was present which needed a solution. By the decision to have all events of the tournament completed before the start of the professional convention, many students who were under the supervision of a faculty member desiring to attend the convention were thus idle for two days. As a result of thought and planning, there evolved the Congress of Human Relations.

Like the forensic tournament, the Congress has been modified and altered over the years. In brief, however, it has been fostered as a model legislative assembly under rules of parliamentary procedure. At first, since there was no high school division in the tournament, the Congress was a one-house assembly. In more recent years, the high school students have constituted the lower house and the college students the upper assembly. Some faculty director is appointed each year to get the two houses assembled and organized and to supervise the entire Congress in one way or another. The actual Congress is student-run, however, with each house choosing its officers. Again, as in the forensic tournament, a small registration fee is required for each student entered, the total amount collected being turned over to the Association.

Since the Congress runs two full days (Thursdays and Fridays during the convention), considerable time is available for the measures the two houses wish to consider. All measures are introduced as bills, which must be prepared according to a prescribed form, and are debated, altered, or amended, and voted upon finally. The bills are on timely problems of regional, national, and international concern. Interesting alignments take place among the students, with liberals and conservatives, debating and voting their points of view. The Congress has proved a valuable training ground for legislative debate under rules of parliamentary practice. Significantly, a great many problems of special concern to the South have been threshed out by the students from far and wide over the region.

Historically, both the forensic tournament and the Congress have become integral parts of the Association. Instead of any current of public opinion being evident to abandon them, the opposite is true. The Association is devoted to them as avenues for experimentation and sound educational objectives. Practically, too, the Association makes no apology for the fact that it secures certain annual operational revenues from them. The fact that the Association has never incurred any indebtedness and has always met its obligations, including the heavy expenses of publishing *The Southern Speech Journal*, is explained in no small measure by the income derived from the tournament and Congress. Moreover, the tournament and Congress have been supported over the years by many schools—some continuously and some more intermittently—and by faculty people who deserve much credit for services rendered and leadership unselfishly given.

THEATRE IN NASHVILLE DURING THE CIVIL WAR

O. G. BROCKETT

THE CIVIL WAR, which brought hardship and limited activity to theatres in most cities of the South, thrust Nashville into a period of theatrical prosperity greater than any it enjoyed either before or after the war years. This paradox is easily unravelled: Nashville was the first sizable city of the Confederacy to fall to Federal forces, and its status during the war was that of an occupied city in which large numbers of enemy troops were quartered. Mainly as a result of the Union occupation of 1862-65, theatres in Nashville enjoyed unprecedented popularity and financial success, the number of theatres in operation increasing from one to four during these years. Even during its brief period under the Confederacy, Nashville had one of the most vital theatres in the South and probably was exceeded in range and level of available entertainment only by Richmond and New Orleans.

The Presidential election of November, 1860, brought the nation to a new crisis of tension and led to the closing of the theatres. Even in New York City only one theatre remained open during the winter of 1860-61. Thus, at the time of the formation of the Confederacy, theatrical activities throughout the country were in a state of suspension.¹ With its definite commitment to a Confederacy, however, the South experienced a surge of optimism, and soon there was a demand for entertainment. In the fall of 1861 theatrical activity recommenced in several southern cities, although only Nashville, Richmond, and New Orleans were able to carry on regular theatrical seasons for 1861-62. All southern cities were faced with the difficult problem of assembling acting companies, for almost without exception the established actors and managers had gone north with the outbreak of hostilities. As a result, few cities were able to have permanent resident companies during the war; even

Mr. Brockett (Ph.D. Stanford University, 1953), formerly a member of the faculty of Stetson University, is Assistant Professor of Dramatic Art at the State University of Iowa.

¹George C. D. Odell, *Annals of the New York Stage* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), Vol. VII.

such well-established theatre centers as Charleston and Savannah were forced to rely on brief visits from travelling troupes.²

In September, 1861, only two legitimate theatres in the South opened for the winter season. One of these was in Nashville, which was at the time only a medium-sized city in relation to other population centers in the south.³ The flag of the Confederacy had been raised over Nashville in June when Tennessee officially became the eleventh of the Confederate States of America, although in effect the state had been committed to the Confederate side as early as April. While public feeling continued unsettled during the summer and fall of 1861, Nashville's theatre nevertheless reopened on September 23, thus becoming one of the first legitimate theatres in the Confederacy to reopen.

Possibly the city's fine theatre building accounts in part for the early resumption of dramatic activities in Nashville. Constructed under the provisions of an act passed by the state legislature in 1849, the theatre (first called the Adelphi) was said to have cost \$25,000 and to possess the second largest stage in the United States. It had been occupied during the 1850's by a resident company which was frequently augmented by visits from established stars, but had been forced to close because of lack of patronage in 1857. It was then taken over by William Crisp, who renamed it the Gaiety and operated a stock company there until the unsettled affairs of November, 1860, again made the theatre an unprofitable enterprise. In the decade preceding the war, then, the theatre had enjoyed moderate success. Following Crisp's departure the theatre remained empty during the winter except for a two-week visit by the Aeolian Minstrels.

When the theatre reopened on September 23, 1861, it was under the management of Walter Keeble, an English actor who had played widely throughout the South and was "familiarily and favorably known" in Nashville.⁴ Keeble leased the theatre, renamed it the Nashville Theatre, and assembled a small troupe which was advertised as the "Southern Star Company." The actors, beside Keeble himself, were Harry Everett, E. R. Dalton, Harry Duncan,

²For a description of general theatrical conditions in the South, exclusive of Tennessee, see Iline Fife, *The Theatre during the Confederacy* (Ph.D., diss., Louisiana State University, 1949).

³U. S. Eighth Census.

⁴*Republican Banner*, September 15, 1861.

James Harrison, Ida Vernon, Mrs. Duncan, Mrs. Dalton, Annie Taylor, Annie Scanlon, and Mrs. Dyke. These names reappear in theatrical records of all the major cities of the Confederacy, for later many of these actors were individually to form the centers of acting companies in various parts of the South. Their abilities as actors and managers account for much of the strength of the Confederate theatre.⁵

The company played at the Nashville Theatre six nights a week, each program usually consisting of a full-length play, an entre-acte of songs and dances, and a short farce. The bill for the opening night is typical: a "grand overture" was followed by *The Gamester* (starring Keeble and Ida Vernon), an interval of songs and music, and *Urgent Private Affairs* starring Harry Everett and Mrs. E. R. Dalton). The repertory of full-length plays was made up largely from the popular works of the first half of the nineteenth century, such as *The Stranger*, *All That Glitters is Not Gold*, *Charles the Second*, *The Lady of Lyons*, *Pizarro*, *Camille*, *Still Waters Run Deep*, *Lucretia Borgia*, *Richelieu*, *The Corsican Brothers*, *Money* and *The Drunkard*. By October the company had begun to offer Shakespearean plays: *Othello* was presented October 9, *Romeo and Juliet* October 18, *Macbeth* November 2 and 17. *Richard III* November 23 and 28, *Hamlet* December 2, and *Antony and Cleopatra* January 10.

With very few exceptions, the offerings of the theatre ignored the war. No plays which used the war as background were presented during this period, although the city played host briefly to Fritz's *Panopticon of the South* at Masonic Hall in November. This popular "diorama" was a forerunner of the modern newsreel; using moving scale figures before a series of painted views, it depicted scenes of the war, including the bombardment of Fort Sumter and, at its final appearance, three new views of the Battle of Manassas.⁶ Another offering related at least obliquely to the war was the troupe billed as "Zouaves, French Soldiers from the Crimea and Algeria" which had a brief engagement at the

⁵On October 16 an advertisement destined to lure some of Keeble's best acting talent away appeared in the *Republican Banner*. John Hill Hewitt announced the opening of the Richmond Theatre and invited actors to apply. In response to this notice Ida Vernon left the company at the end of October; Katie Estelle replaced her in the leading roles.

⁶*Republican Banner*, November 30, 1861.

theatre in November, performing short operettas with military backgrounds and presently precision military drill. The Zouaves," who throughout the South, were not greeted by adverse comment in the newspapers at the time of their appearance, but came in for belated criticism the following January when it was learned that they had crossed over the Union side:

The "French Zouaves," whose performances in this city, about two months since, resulted in such a grand disgust, have gone North under a flag of truce *via* Norfolk.⁷

This is one of very few instances in which actors crossed the lines of war during this period.

The theatre was well attended during this first wartime season, the newspapers reporting at regular intervals that it was filled every night with "large and appreciative audiences." An article titled "Revival of Drama in Nashville," appearing in the *Republican Banner* of November 10, reported that the previous season money had been so scarce that "the Theatre was closed for want of patronage, while the present season has been as prosperous as the management could have expected from the first."⁸ Although the regular citizens of Nashville continue to patronize the theatre at this time, an article in the *Banner* of December 8 noted that the reason for nightly crowds at the theatre was the floating population of soldiers and civilians which made a place of amusement a necessity. Thus, even under the Confederacy Nashville's theatre owed its prosperity in part to wartime conditions and a transient population.

The successful first season of Keeble's Southern Star Company ended abruptly in February, 1862, when the capture of Fort Donelson by Union troops signalled disaster for Nashville. The ensuing "Great Panic" caused not only the closing of the theatre but the flight of most of its personnel. Keeble and a majority of his actors were absorbed into the Confederate theatre and became major stars for the rest of the war. The season of 1860-61 had been profitable and, in comparison with other theatres in the South, extremely good

⁷*Republican Banner*, January 11, 1862.

⁸During this period, pieces of real dramatic criticism appear in the newspapers less frequently than "puffs" which are merely disguised advertisements; consequently these statements cannot always be taken at face value. The newspapers do appear to have been candid about the relative financial success of each theatrical venture, however, as can be seen by comparing the notices during prosperous periods with those when attendance was poor.

both in talent and repertory. It had established Nashville as a major theatrical center during its brief period as part of the Confederacy.

II. The Theatre under Union Occupation

Nashville was formally surrendered to Federal forces on February 25, 1862, and the Sixth Ohio Regiment marched in to occupy the city. As headquarters of General Buell, the city rapidly developed into an important center of operations for Union troops. The soldiers demanded entertainment, and a theatre was opened less than two months after the closing of Keeble's company, despite the unsettled state of affairs which prevailed. From this time on, however, the theatre had a new status. Almost completely unattended by the regular citizens of Nashville, it became an institution which existed primarily for the benefit of occupation troops and those civilians whose affairs were dependent on the military. The reasons for the neglect of the theatre by the regular citizens are probably several: economic hardship, which made theatre-going a luxury too expensive for most; the general conditions of disorder and lawlessness which prevailed from time to time and made people unwilling to leave their homes at night (citizens were assaulted by stray bands of soldiers, and burglaries and incendiary fires occurred almost daily); and the fact that in the minds of the citizens, many of whom had sons fighting in the Confederate army, the theatre soon became identified with the Union side of the conflict.⁹ Efforts were made to lure the respectable citizens back to the theatre by newspaper notices assuring them of their safety, announcements that Confederate money would be accepted, and praise for the company's "high-toned character." Despite claims that "fashionable audiences" (including ladies) were in attendance, the theatre failed in its attempt to reestablish itself as a gathering-place for the citizens of Nashville.¹⁰

⁹In May, 1863, the Provost Marshall issued an order that the theatre orchestras must play at least three national airs at each performance, with the threat of closing all places of amusement and imprisonment for managers if the order was not carried out. *Nashville Daily Press*, May 5, 1863.

¹⁰Typical notices appeared in the *Republican Banner* of October 6 and 11, December 8, and January 11, 1862, and in the *Nashville Dispatch* of April 18, 23, 24, June 1 and 24, August 17, 1862, April 1, 1863, and thereafter at fairly regular intervals.

Soon after the occupation the city was placed under martial law and a curfew imposed; newspapers fell into the hands of Unionist sympathizers and were published under close military supervision. Nashville was not far from the stronghold of Confederate troops. When General Bragg moved his forces northward into Kentucky in September of 1862, the city was believed threatened with recapture, and in early November an abortive attempt to storm the city from the south was made by Forrest and Morgan. During January of 1863, following the Union defeat of Bragg at Murfreesboro with heavy losses on both sides, trainloads of wounded poured into Nashville. All of this undoubtedly contributed to the already disturbed internal affairs of the city. Under the military governorship of Andrew Johnson, oppressive measures were instituted against citizens known to have favored secession or suspected of Confederate sympathies, and hardly a day passed without the arrest of some prominent person.¹¹ All of these factors conspired to keep the regular citizens at home and to make the theatre increasingly dependent on catering to a transient population. Consequently, although the theatre was troubled by transportation difficulties¹² and the whims of the military government, it was not adversely affected by the economic perils of the civilian population. During the financial crisis of the summer of 1862, for example, when business in the city was at a virtual standstill, the theatre enjoyed good attendance.

The company which reopened at the Nashville Theatre during the early weeks of the occupation was managed by S. B. Duffield, who was to be the leading figure in the Nashville theatre during the rest of the war. After a brief engagement by Campbell's Minstrels in mid-April, the theatre opened under Duffield's management on April 21. Duffield had hired two members of Keeble's company, Annie Scanlon and Harry Everett (the latter a comedian who became a favorite with audiences in Nashville), and had as partner

¹¹Stanley F. Horn, "Nashville during the Civil War," *Tennessee Old and New: Sesquicentennial Edition* (Nashville, Tennessee Historical Commission and Tennessee Historical Society, 1946), Vol. II, pp. 231-232.

¹²Performances were cancelled and programs altered when visiting actors were unable to reach Nashville. A "Senoreta Cubas, great artist, pantomimist, and Danseuse," was detained when her train was held up at Louisville in November, 1863, and in December the arrival of visiting star Jane Combs was so delayed that she walked onto the stage immediately upon arrival, without rehearsal. *Dispatch*, November 23 and December 2, 1863.

during the first season J. E. Sands. At first the company was small and the repertory restricted to short farces intermingled with songs and dances. By May 1 there were several new members; of special importance were Claude Hamilton and Mrs. Hattie Bernard, who were to play leading roles at the theatre for the next two years. After their arrival the quality of the repertory gradually improved and more serious plays, such as *The Stranger*, *The Lady of Lyons*, and *The Drunkard*, were presented. Other new actors arrived in late May, and the *Dispatch* of May 27 announced that the company had been sufficiently enlarged to permit the production of "Shakespearean and other Favorite Tragedies and Select Comedies."¹³ After this time Shakespearean plays were produced at regular intervals; among the plays were *Othello*, *Richard III*, and *The Taming of the Shrew*. Other plays added to the repertory included *She Stoops to Conquer*, *William Tell*, *The Robbers*, *The Corsican Brothers*, *Black-Eyed Susan*, *Money*, and *Charles the Second*. The usual type of program was offered: a full-length play, an interval of songs and dances, and a farce. When the season ended on July 12, the theatre had developed a repertory equal to that of Keeble's company.

Business was so good that the theatre remained closed only until July 23, when it opened for a summer season. Duffield and E. Sprague were now managers, S. T. Simons was engaged as treasurer, and an orchestra was advertised as a regular attraction. The troupe began the summer with a reduced company and consequently with a repertory made up primarily of light farces. Nevertheless attendance continued to be good, and the *Dispatch* of July 25 called attention to the fact that Nashville was "favored above any of the minor cities in having a Theatre to attend" during the times.

The summer season continued until September 8, and the season of 1862-63 began without interruption the following day. Events beyond the control of the theatre management soon brought the season to a halt, however. Members of an Ohio regiment got drunk on a Saturday night in early September, crowded into the Negro gallery, and beat all the Negroes they found there, throwing many downstairs. This conduct led to the closing of the theatre by order

¹³The company at this time included Mr. Duffield, Mr. Everett, Miss Constantine, Miss Scanlon, F. R. Pierce, Claude Hamilton, Mrs. Bernard, Mr. Fletcher, Harry Weaver, Mr. Tyler, Miss Madeleine Moore, and Mr. Gross.

of General Negley from September 19 until November 12, 1862.¹⁴ During this period only a few matinee performances were given, under close surveillance of military guards, mainly for the financial relief of the actors.

During the enforced closure a number of changes were made in the theatre's personnel, with Duffield again becoming sole manager and Claude Hamilton stage manager, while Simons remained treasurer.¹⁵ The theatre made a rapid recovery and by December 10 the *Dispatch* reported that it was so well attended that only standing room was available to those who did not arrive early. A second interruption followed on January 21, 1863, when the theatre was forced to close because of a shortage of coal needed to furnish the city with gas for illumination.¹⁶ This interruption was of short duration, however, and the season was resumed on February 2. Duffield utilized the break to journey to Cincinnati and Louisville to recruit more actors.¹⁷

Following its reopening in February the theatre entered a new era. There were no more forced closures, the theatre grew rapidly in favor with the public, and performances were continuous through the rest of the war, except for brief summer recesses. Whatever reservations the military commanders may have had seem to have disappeared, for not only were the soldiers the chief support of the theatre, but representatives of the military frequently appeared as part of the program. Nightly appearances of the band of the Eighth Kansas began on February 25, and W. E. Sheridan, advertised as "the talented young actor and brave soldier," appeared in numerous starring roles. The military commanders themselves frequently attended the theatre; General Grant appeared at the theatre during his visit to Nashville in December, 1863.¹⁸ Further indication of a new respect for the theatre is found in the record of benefits. In addition to the regular receipts, very handsome gifts were presented: a diamond ring "worth \$125" to Mrs. Bernard, a diamond pin to

¹⁴*Dispatch*, September 19 and November 11, 1862.

¹⁵The company now consisted of Hamilton, Harry Davis, Harry Everett, William Foster, Mr. Radcliffe, Mr. Allen, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Wight, Mrs. Bernard, Miss Constantine, Mrs. Allen, and Miss Scanlon.

¹⁶*Dispatch*, January 20, 1863.

¹⁷These were C. Leslie Allen, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Jordan, and Lynn and Allie Vern.

¹⁸*Dispatch*, December 22, 1863.

Harry Everett, and a diamond pin "costing \$200" and a seal ring to Mr. Simons.¹⁹

Furthermore, one theatre was no longer sufficient to meet the demand for entertainment. On February 24, two of Duffield's former associates, Sprague and J. R. Allen, engaged Odd Fellows' Hall for "Sprague's Minstrels and Cornet Band, comprising fifteen talented performers and La Belle Louise, the charming danseuse and comedienne."²⁰ This new attraction, typical of the "variety" programs of the period, played to good audiences until May 4, when it closed to make way for Nashville's second legitimate theatre. J. R. Allen rented Odd Fellows' Hall, enlarged and remodelled it, and christened it the New Nashville Theatre. Allen was manager, George Burt the "Acting Manager and Artist," and the company, advertised as the "Best Dramatic Company in the Country," starred Mary Mitchell and M. W. Leffingwell as leading actors.²¹ The spirit of competition between the New and old Nashville Theatres was apparent from the opening night, when both houses presented *Lucretia Borgia*. Both theatres were reported full and both continued to have good business. Nashville was now able and willing to support two legitimate theatres.

Soon after this time both theatres adopted the same system: with a resident company as nucleus, well-known actors were presented in short engagements in their own starring vehicles. Although not fully developed until the season of 1863-64, the policy was put into effect immediately at the New Nashville, which presented such minor actresses as Pauline Cushman and Lottie Hough during its first season. The fact that actors could be induced to travel so near a danger area indicated improved transportation and a more settled situation. In an effort to counteract the popularity of the new theatre, Duffield leased Wood's theatres in Cincinnati and Louisville, beginning July 4, 1863, and thus gained the advantage of having three companies at his disposal. By shifting personnel from one theatre to another, he added novelty to his offerings, as well as gaining bargaining power by being able to offer an actor a

¹⁹*Dispatch*, March 7 and 22, April 19, 1863.

²⁰*Dispatch*, February 24, 1863.

²¹*Dispatch*, May 9, 1863. Other actors advertised in the company were Carrie Novarre, Mrs. George Burt, Mrs. J. R. Allen, William Davis, H. Taylor, T. Mason, C. Morgan, J. R. Allen, and Wallace Hume.

profitable engagement at three theatres instead of one. To these three he added the Lexington theatre in December, 1863.²²

The New Nashville closed the season of 1862-63 on July 4 with a patriotic spectacle, *The Battle of King's Mountain*, while the Nashville Theatre continued until July 20. Again business was so profitable that neither theatre remained closed long. Duffield's reopened August 9, after minor repairs to the theatre and the addition of new personnel. Flynn became the partner of Duffield and managed the Nashville theatre, while Duffield devoted most of his attention to the theatres in Louisville and Cincinnati.

During its recess the New Nashville Theatre was extensively remodelled and enlarged to seat 1500 persons; the auditorium was redecorated and new scenery was painted. It reopened on August 31 with J. R. Allen as manager, T. B. Radcliffe (formerly with Duffield's company) as stage manager, W. Fletcher and Simon Moesta as "Scenic Artists."²³ The addition of scenic artists to the staff of theatres at this time indicates that an increased care was taken in the mounting of productions and that such expenditures were made possible by good attendance. The New Nashville also added a Corps de Ballet.

During the season of 1863-64, the New Nashville featured a number of "horse-pieces," beginning with R. E. J. Miles and his horse, Hiawatha, in *Rookwood*, later followed by *The Terror of the Road*, *Mazeppa*, and other plays featuring daring feats of horsemanship and starring Kate Fisher, Leo Hudson, and other equestrian stars. The performances were so popular that matinees were added in September. Perhaps in an attempt to counteract the popularity of the "horse-pieces," the Nashville Theatre introduced a series of "ghost plays." A device for making especially realistic ghosts by projecting an image on a piece of plate glass had been used with great success in New York the preceding season. This new device was first seen in Nashville on September 30. It had been scheduled for September 23, but the plate glass had been broken and the ghost had had to await the arrival of a new piece of glass.²⁴ Every con-

²²*Dispatch*, July 22 and December 17, 1863.

²³*Dispatch*, August 20, 1863. The Nashville Theatre had already added J. H. West and George Morris as "Scenic Artists," according to the *Dispatch* of August 9, 1863.

²⁴*Dispatch*, September 23, 1863.

ceivable use was made of the new attraction, even to the extent of advertising *Hamlet* as that "great ghost drama."²⁵

With the season of 1863-64 the wartime theatre of Nashville reached its full maturity. From this time until the end of the war, both theatres operated to full capacity without interruption except for a brief recess in July and August, 1864. The leading stars of the American stage appeared in Nashville in a repertory to equal any offered in the American theatre of the day. During the seasons of 1863-64 and 1864-65, the New Nashville was host to such stars as Laura Keane, Julia Daly, Avonia Jones, Maggie Mitchell, Mrs. George Farren, E. L. Davenport, and J. W. Wallack, Jr., while the Nashville Theatre presented John Wilkes Booth, Mathilda Heron, C. W. and Eliza Coudock, John E. Owens, Helen Western, Emma Waller, Kate Denin, and Edwin Adams.

By the spring of 1865 these two theatres were no longer able to fulfill the demand for entertainment, and two more theatres joined the ranks. Both were variety houses, although the first had a high-sounding name: the Nashville Opera House. The other, Poland's Variety Theatre, which started out in temporary quarters while a new theatre was being constructed, opened in its own building on April 8, 1865, five days after Tennessee rejoined the Union. Thus, at the end of the war the theatre in Nashville was at its peak, for never before nor afterwards was it able to support four professional theatres.

It must be concluded that, theatrically speaking, Nashville fared better than any city in the South during the war period. No other city exceeded it in terms of quality (judging from the repertory and actors presented), and only Richmond can be compared to it in point of quantity. Richmond, however, reached its height during the season of 1863-64 and thereafter declined because of inflationary prices and the shortage of materials and actors, while Nashville's theatre continued to grow. Richmond never had more than four places of amusement open at one time, and it never had two legitimate theatres of the quality of the Nashville and New Nashville theatres.²⁶ Not only was Nashville's theatre one of the first to reopen following the outbreak of hostilities (preceded only

²⁵*Dispatch*, October 23, 1863.

²⁶Fife, *op. cit.*

by New Orleans), but it produced a regular season of legitimate drama each year with a steady improvement in quality.

On the other hand, Nashville's theatre, like Richmond's, was a wartime theatre, and its period of prosperity ended with the war. Immediately following the end of hostilities, patronage began to decline. First the two variety houses closed, then the New Nashville became a variety house, but failing at this returned to the legitimate drama, only to close completely before the end of 1866. The Nashville Theatre was able to find support for only a six-weeks season in 1866-67, the company leaving for Savannah on October 29, 1866; and the season of 1867-68 lasted only five weeks, ending on November 1, 1867, and exciting the following comment in the *Nashville Gazette*:

The war was the only era during which our theaters proved remunerative, and then their support came, not from our citizens, but from a nomadic class among us, whose patronage served to drag down the stage to the level of a brothel.

Thus, within two years after the end of the Civil War, the Nashville theatre had almost ceased to exist.

CLASSICAL AND EUROPEAN TRADITIONS OF RHETORIC AND SPEECH TRAINING

WILBUR SAMUEL HOWELL

THE LATEST TENDENCY in college textbooks in public speaking is to use illustrations in connection with the printed doctrine. Sometimes these illustrations are comic-strip drawings presumably designed to assure college readers that every effort has been taken to present the principles of speechmaking in terms of the stereotypes of the eight-year-old. Sometimes these illustrations are actual photographs of men or women with their mouths open, their faces twisted into a defiant pugnacity, their hands raised in gestures of belligerence, and their target an unseen audience apparently afflicted with cretinism. The image that all of these illustrations bring to mind is that of the speaker as a disembodied mouth, a domineering gesture, or a smooth profile who overcomes all opposition with the ease of Superman. There is no hint that the speaker is a thinker, a scholar; no implication that he talks to audiences for the glory of God and the relief of man's estate; no assurance that his motives are above those of the dispensers of patent remedies in the old-time medicine show; no acknowledgment that he deals with issues in the domain of what Walter Lippmann calls the public philosophy; and above all no thought that he owes responsibility to himself and his audience to be accurately schooled in the knowledges that lie behind his subject matter and in the methods of rationality and good sense.

Between the world of these self-assertive speakers and the world of the modern seminar and research library there is a considerable gulf. Rhetoric has always been an object of suspicion to philosophers; but only in our own troubled century has that suspicion grown to the point where it has crowded out the confident assertion of rhetoricians that their subject for all her faults serves the cause of good more often than of evil. Thus it is that today the community of scholarship is endeavoring to do without rhetoric altogether or to belittle her function in the educational process. Scientists,

Mr. Howell (Ph.D., Cornell, 1931) is Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory, Princeton University. His paper was delivered at the Centennial Convention of the National Education Association in Philadelphia, July 1, 1957, to a meeting sponsored by the Speech Association of America.

philosophers, and humanists accept knowledge as the ultimate end of their endeavor, and inquiry into the unknown as their deepest professional obligation. Communication is supposed either to happen spontaneously after a man's mind is filled with truth or to be capable of being productively taught only in the elementary stages of education where its problems can be reduced to those of correct accent, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. Faced with this sort of attitude on the part of scientists and scholars, rhetoric has assumed the counterattitude of rage and belligerency, as shown in the modern textbook photographs of the speaker, or the guise of a smooth and unperturbed audacity, as depicted in comic-strip characterizations of the smart speaker's conduct.

It will take great educational statesmanship to bring the rhetorician and the scholar together in the modern curriculum. As I see the problem, the scholar, the man of learning, must be induced to assume responsibility for making his knowledge available to the public, and to accept rhetoric as a willing and respectable partner in this enterprise. But the rhetorician, too, has his responsibilities. He must not sell out to Madison Avenue. He must come to the man of learning with learning of his own, acquired in part in the classrooms of scholars and scientists in the liberal arts colleges, and in part in his own advanced study of the classical and European traditions of rhetoric herself.

The traditions behind rhetoric afford an opportunity to study the relations existing in the past between subject matter and form, science and art, learning and communication. Thus they afford an opportunity to see how the dilemma of our own generation has been solved in past eras. We cannot hope, of course, to solve our problems by applying solutions that we find to have been used for analogous problems in ancient or medieval or Renaissance Europe. Our solutions must be devised with our own problems in mind. But, as I see it, the great value in studying classical and European traditions of rhetoric is that, by understanding what treaties have been drawn up in the past between learning and communication, we can get an informed idea of the treaty that must be worked out in our own time between these same two social instruments; and, if we can bring peace between them once more, we may hope to be counted among the important peacemakers of this era, and to be hailed

as having broken through the iron curtain between our men of thought and our men of words.

The Aristotelian synthesis was one in which rhetoric was considered the counterpart of dialectic and a collateral relative of poetics. These three arts, taken together, constituted for Aristotle the theory of discourse in its essential branches. Poetics, which he saw as including the theory of dramatic, epic, and lyric poetry, occupied in his system the place which we reserve not only for the forms of poetry but also for the types of fiction. Nonfictional discourse to Aristotle was the property of dialectic and rhetoric. Dialectic controlled the process of communication in the learned world—the communication that took place between one expert and another in the community of scholars or between teacher and pupil in the university. Rhetoric controlled discourse between the expert and the populace; it was the art of reaching the popular audience. "The duty of rhetoric," remarks Aristotle in a historic passage in his great treatise on this art,¹ "is to deal with such matters as we deliberate upon without arts or systems to guide us, in the hearing of persons who cannot take in at a glance a complicated argument, or follow a long chain of reasoning."

In assuming control over discourse addressed to such persons as these, whom Aristotle at another point specifically described as "an audience of untrained thinkers,"² rhetoric became in ancient Greece the art of popular persuasion, since the typical relation at that time between speaker and populace was expressed in terms of the social and political need to induce the citizen to act wisely. Popular exposition as the companion of popular persuasion was not a feature of Aristotle's system; indeed, exposition as an end of rhetoric developed later as scientific knowledge became an ingredient of elementary and popular education and as the rise of modern popular government created a need for the widest possible diffusion of information. But even if Aristotle did not set forth an expositional rhetoric, he did a thorough job with the rhetoric of persuasion. He dwelt upon the three central means of influencing conduct—logical arguments, emotional appeals, and ethical inducements. He dwelt upon the methods of finding these means in the facts of a

¹*Rhetoric*, trans. W. Rhys Roberts, in *Aristotle Rhetoric and Poetics* (New York: The Modern Library, 1954), p. 27.

²*Ibid.*, p. 27.

given case and in considerations common to all cases. He dwelt upon the arranging of subject matter into speeches; upon the expressing of subject matter in appropriate style; and to some extent upon the delivering of speeches to audiences. Always his emphasis was upon speaking and oral communication, because he lived at a time when the only way to have one message apprehended simultaneously by many men was to have it uttered by one voice and heard by as many ears as that voice could reach by natural means. But Aristotle's focus upon the speech is hardly a limitation upon his teachings. Most of what nonfictional writing knows about communication has been learned from the art of speaking, and little that the speaker knows has to be unlearned when he commits his thoughts to written form. Thus the speech can embody the essential lessons of communication, and in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* it did.

In the person of Aristotle scholarship and rhetoric found a common champion. After all, Aristotle taught Western Europe its early lessons in a dozen sciences and taught these lessons so well that he was considered the ultimate scientific authority until the age of Bacon and Descartes; and while he was performing this mighty task, he was also serving as the ultimate authority in Western Europe in the field of communication theory, as his dialectic and rhetoric were systematized, interpreted, and transmitted by Cicero, Quintilian, Boethius, and very many later authors, not excluding Ramus and Whatley. By combining the functions of the authoritative scholar and the authoritative rhetorician, Aristotle played a decisive part in keeping his philosophical disciples reminded of their obligations to communication, and his rhetorical disciples reminded of their obligations to science and learning. Thus he made it easy and natural for scholars to be rhetoricians, and rhetoricians, scholars. And his immense prestige in each of these worlds engendered a mutual respect between them and taught them the temporary lesson of peaceful coexistence.

It was in the Renaissance that the Aristotelian synthesis began to disintegrate. The discovery of America led men to hope that if they sailed beyond familiar headlands in the intellectual as in the geographical sphere, they would uncover facts not dreamed of in their accepted philosophy. Uncover facts they did. A new science, based upon the relentless study of natural objects, emerged. The highest rewards went to the explorers of the new worlds opening

before the astonished eyes of the young men of ancient Europe. They

Look'd at each other with a wild surmise—
Silent, upon a peak in Darien.

And the awe-struck silence that descended upon them was in a sense a reflection that all their energies were being expended upon the quest for knowledge, not upon the means of communicating it.

At any rate, science has outstripped rhetoric since the Renaissance in terms of the capacity of science to add significantly to its own store of truth, and in terms of the importance of science in the curriculum. Meanwhile, logic has detached itself more and more from a concern for communication, and has attached itself more and more to a concern for scientific inquiry. Thus has rhetoric lost her ancient partnership with learning and philosophy. As these developments have taken place, rhetoric has had the wisdom at moments to absorb the old logic into her own subject matter and to add exposition to her list of interests, while at other moments she has had the folly to indulge in such recessive practices as that of specializing in voice and gesture under the influence of the elocutionists, or that of espousing sales techniques under the influence of modern advertising. Small wonder that a gap has opened between the modern rhetorician and the great new sciences of the modern world, thanks to the follies of rhetoric and the preoccupation of science with the quest for truth. Small wonder that modern science has been too busy to take the time to understand rhetoric as she should be understood, or to sympathize with her aims wherever they prove themselves worthy of praise. Small wonder that philosophy has abandoned rhetoric almost to the exact degree that rhetoric has abandoned philosophy.

As for the future of rhetoric, we could not do better than to hope that a new synthesis will be found to replace the Aristotelian synthesis, and that the new synthesis will reflect the desire by scientists and scholars to respect rhetoric and use her wisely and skillfully, even as it reflects the desire by rhetoricians to show accomplishments in scholarship and science in connection with the performance of their duties towards the arts of communication. Peace between the world of learning and the world of rhetoric will not come from the contempt of science for rhetoric, or from the belliger-

ent assertions by rhetoric of her own superiority. Peace will come only from the developing respect of each for the other. And that respect will ultimately rest upon the recognition that science and scholarship need rhetoric in the sense that she is the organization of knowledges governing the communication of truth to the present and to succeeding generations, while rhetoric needs scholarship and science in order to understand herself and to learn which of the competing ideologies of our time are most reasonable, most humane, and hence most worthy to be made the subject of the speaker's loyalty and dedication.

TECHNIQUES OF THERAPY FOR THE LARYNGECTOMIZED PATIENT

JEANNETTE K. LAGUAITE

ESOPHAGEAL SPEECH is at once one of the simplest and most challenging types of speech cases. I say simplest because many laryngectomized persons learn to use quite acceptable esophageal speech without any training whatsoever. It is challenging in that we know so little about the whole process of production of the pseudo-voice and about the factors involved in the development of fluent esophageal speech.

Since cancer in general and cancer of the larynx in particular are on the increase, it is incumbent on every speech therapist to be able to handle the laryngectomized patient. The best estimate by the American Cancer Society is that there are between 35 and 40 thousand cases at present in the United States. It is said that carcinoma of the larynx is increasing at the rate of about 3% or 4% per year. At the same time, the death rate for this procedure is dropping so that in reality the increase is greater than these figures would show. These facts would suggest about 1500 or 2000 new cases each year. The average age of the subject is between 50 and 60 years. With increased emphasis on early detection and early surgery, the age range can be expected to drop at least 5 years and possibly more in the next decade.

Loss of the normal means of communication is the most traumatizing effect of laryngectomy. Unfortunately, too many patients are seen only after operation when communication is difficult or impossible and when they are in the throes of a depression produced by their condition. If the patient and his family could be seen pre-operatively it is felt that therapeutic efforts might be enhanced in several ways:

First, the person can and should be told that although he will not speak again in the normal way, it is possible to learn to talk again by another method. This pre-operative preparation will reduce his anxiety and post-operative depression and will serve as a

Miss Laguaite (Ph.D., Louisiana State, 1952) is Assistant Professor of Speech Pathology and Educational Director of the Speech and Hearing Center of the Tulane University Medical School of Louisiana.

motivating force when actual lessons are begun. If the patient has the opportunity to talk with a successful esophageal speaker before and during hospitalization, the emotional adjustment of the patient is usually strengthened. This pre-operative preparation is the responsibility of the surgeon and unfortunately, there are still many who do not see that the patients receive this important counsel.

Second, pre-operative opportunity to talk with the patient will enable the therapist or social worker to get a social history which will reveal much worthwhile information and help to predict the response to therapy. For example, the person who is psychotic or extremely dependent could very easily use this handicapping condition as an excuse for his not returning to his former role in society. In that case, the patient would probably not do well in therapy because of an unconscious rejection of speech.

Third, pre-operative contact with the patient also means that valuable information can be gained while normal channels of communication are still open. Following operation, the patient who has to write everything usually reduces his communicative efforts to a minimum. With the illiterate patient the success of communication usually depends upon the therapist's skill in lip-reading or understanding of whispered speech. Let me hasten to say, however, that with such patients progress is usually rapid because of the high motivation factor. When one cannot read or write, the need for developing verbal communication becomes acute.

Fourth, the degree of speech skill which the person possessed before operation is important and will help to determine his needs in therapy. Speech mannerisms which the person uses may be a part of his former pattern and not necessarily related to his new production of speech, although they may interfere with its total efficiency. Unless we have this information ahead of time we may think that these patterns developed as a result of using esophageal speech.

Following surgery, the patient is ready for speech therapy as soon as the surgeon is sure that there is no chance of a fistula developing. Since the surgeon generally watches the patient for several days after the removal of the feeding tube, speech therapy can safely be begun two or three weeks after surgery but may be started as soon as ten days, depending upon the bias of the individual surgeon.

The first step in the production of a pseudo-voice is using the air in the mouth and learning to dissociate it with the air used for

breathing. Many patients have difficulty in changing their speech patterns and still try to use the air being inhaled and exhaled through the tracheostoma as the motive power for speech. This leads to noisy inhalations and exhalations and detracts from the speaker's general efficiency.

Therapy begins with a discussion of the difference between normal and esophageal speech structures by showing a chart or by drawing a diagram and explaining the two processes. The diagram serves to impress on the patient the concept that the air entering and leaving the opening in the neck is no longer useful to him for speech and that he must learn to take in a new supply of air into the pharynx and that this is usually done with a swallowing movement of the tongue. Investigators seem to be agreed that the sound is produced by the constriction of the cricopharyngeus muscle which forms the lumen of the esophagus. It also seems to be generally agreed that the air should not be forced down much further beyond this area of constriction to produce the most efficient speech.¹

In order to demonstrate the use of the air in the mouth the patient is taught to make the sounds [p], [t], and [k]. He is told that this will be the way he will make these sounds all the time. The [k] is particularly important because the upward and backward movement of the tongue is thought to be similar to the movement necessary in trapping the air in the upper esophagus.

After the patient gets good [p], [t], and [k] sounds, he is asked to keep his mouth closed while he moves his tongue as though to produce a [k]. The final step is to open the mouth, release the tongue and push out the air. It is here that the therapist must be careful that the patient does not simply blow air out of the tracheal opening. It may be necessary to return frequently to the use of the voiceless plosives before the patient achieves a true vibration.

It is much easier to keep the patient from developing bad habits of facial grimaces, noisy inhalations, exhalations of air, or other evidences of tension than it is to eliminate them. It has often been noted that since patients feel they have not succeeded in their efforts unless the sound is loud and explosive, they struggle to produce such a vibration. It should be stressed that it is more desirable to get a sound of low intensity which is produced easily and smoothly than to force a loud sound. The increase in volume usually will

¹W. Wallace Morrison, "The Production of Voice and Speech Following Total Laryngectomy," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, XIV, 413-431.

occur spontaneously, probably as a result of the strengthening of muscular action.

Actually, it is best to give as few and as simple directions as possible. Sometimes trying to describe too minutely each movement of the structures involved simply confuses rather than helps. Primarily what the therapist does it to give the patient the principle of using air in the upper esophagus and allow him to figure out for himself just how to do it most easily. Many therapists are agreed that regardless of the method on which the patient was started, once the production of the sound has become automatic, all speakers are doing essentially the same thing and it is difficult even for them to delineate their movements.

A relatively small percentage are not able to achieve this first step. Gardner says "14% are unable to speak a continuous series of words or cannot belch at all."² McCall and Fisher in a series based on the value of pre-operative training, found that 16% were not able to produce a sound.³ In a series of 101 cases the writer found that 12.8% were unable to achieve the production of any sound voluntarily.

As soon as the patient can produce a sound with reasonable success, the next step is to combine sound with articulation. Explain to the patient that what he does with the lips, tongue and palate will be the same as formerly, the only difference with this kind of speech is the method of sound production. Begin by having the person say the vowels, *a, e, i, o, u*, to demonstrate that he can begin to control the sound he is producing by the shaping of the mouth cavity. Sometimes it is easier for the person to progress to this step if the vowels are preceded by the [k] sound, that is, *ka, ke, ki, ko, ku*. This is one example of the individual differences which the therapist must be flexible enough to handle.

The step from vowels to monosyllables in an easy one. The numbers from one to ten make excellent practice material. Seven can be slurred almost to a monosyllable and, because the numbers are so familiar and identifiable, most patients do well on them. *Yes* and *No* are used early in therapy, along with such words as *Fine, Thanks, Please*. Other consonant sounds of the alphabet, such as [b], [m], [l], may be used in combination with the vowels for prac-

²Warren Gardner, "Rehabilitation After Laryngectomy," *Public Health Nursing*, XLIII (November, 1951), 612-614.

³Julius McCall and William Fisher, "Carcinoma of the Larynx," *The Laryngoscope*, LXII (May, 1952), 475-485.

tice material. Again, it may be noted that many patients find words beginning with the velars, [k] and [g], easier to produce. If so, then these words should be used until the person has developed sufficient control to get the sound when accompanied by other tongue positions.

The average patient will soon be ready to progress to two syllables on one intake of air. Practice for this step is given by asking the patient to produce an *ah*, and hold it as long as he can. Caution must be exercised here that the patient does not develop habits of excessive strain at this point. Along with prolonging *ah*, the patient is asked to use two syllables such as *ba-ba*. Returning to the numbers, those from eleven to twenty make good material, as well as the familiar expressions, *Good-bye*, *hello*, *thank you*, and *O.K.* At this stage many patients need help in saying the two syllables smoothly and with the sound blended into that of the second syllable. Many of them use all the air on the first word in an explosive manner so that there is none left for the second.

When the patient has mastered control of the sound at the two or three syllable level, some work on stress and inflection may be started. When "dog" is converted to a two-syllable phrase by the addition of one of the articles, the tendency of most patients is to say, "*the dog*" or "*a cat*." It should be pointed out that the normal speech pattern is one of unequal stress and that these phrases are ordinarily spoken, *the dog*, *a cat*. Similarly, a phrase such as "*in the car*" should not become "*in the car*."

The initial sound produced by the laryngectomized person is usually harsh and lacking in tonal quality. As more control is gained, the sound becomes less harsh and unpleasant. However, it usually remains rather monotonous and extremely low in pitch. Higher pitch and more resonant quality and some degree of inflection can be achieved with practice. Returning to the initial *ah*, the patient can be asked to say it as a question, that is, with a rising inflection. *Yes* and *no*, or longer phrases can be used to vary inflection so that they become either questions or statements of fact.

By the time the patient has reached this point in therapy he should be encouraged to use his speech as much as possible outside the class session. The family should be brought into the training program so that the members understand what can be expected of the patient in the way of communication and how they can help

him to achieve automatic control. As with the stutterer, the patient needs time to get the words out. The listener must be patient and not say it for him. Asking him questions that can be answered in monosyllables or very short phrases helps to build a sense of achievement and motivation to continue.

The final step is the development of sufficient control so that the patient can say five or six syllable phrases clearly, with no obvious or distracting mannerisms associated with taking in or expelling the air. Fluent speech also requires that the individual be able to renew the air quickly so that there will not be long pauses between phrases. One must always remember that we are trying to achieve as near normal speech as possible. This objective requires that the visible as well as the audible aspects must not be distracting or unpleasant. Not much information is available from controlled studies showing how long a time is required to reach this point. In the writer's series of 101 cases the average number of lessons for the fluent speakers was fourteen. Since most of the patients attended class on a once-a-week basis, this number would represent a period of about three months.

The degree of refinement of speech which the individual needs or will attempt is determined, to a large extent, by his general socioeconomic background and by his communicative needs. For the doctor, lawyer, or salesman, or others who require or demand excellent quality, there are many little techniques with which all speech therapists are familiar. More time may be spent on phrasing, that is, where to pause for air intake so that it comes in a natural place in the sentence. Inflection and pitch change may be emphasized. Articulation can be improved by a simple explanation of the characteristics of certain phonetic elements. Some patients will struggle to get a vibration when producing the voiceless sounds. They do not realize that [s], for example, is normally voiceless. Some patients need special work with the nasals because they lack sufficient pressure to produce the required amount of nasal resonance. Explaining the difference between the oral and nasal sounds, having patients hold the lips or tongue in position slightly longer for [m] and [n], having them say pairs of words such as *me, be; no, dough*, to contrast the sounds, — all are helpful in overcoming this problem.

Most of the work done at the Tulane Speech and Hearing Center with laryngectomees is done in group sessions. Of course, there

are always some individuals who work better alone. This is true of any type of speech problem. Sometimes the group sessions will be supplemented by individual lessons for the person who comes from out of town and needs more intensive therapy or for the patient who needs more polishing techniques in the last stages of therapy.

Group therapy has the advantage of bringing together people with similar problems who need to be encouraged and supported in their efforts to re-establish communication. Usually in a group there will be one or more members beyond the first step who can be very helpful in demonstrating the beginning phase. This is particularly true if the therapist is unable to demonstrate the method. A group also provides an opportunity for a natural social situation in which the patient can begin to practice his newly acquired skill without feeling conspicuous. Counting together, asking and answering questions, and other group techniques can be used. These activities must be geared so that each member will participate at his level and will experience a feeling of success and of progress, for, as with other speech problems, the therapist must never forget that he is working with a personality and not simply with a speech defect.

Certain physical factors present real problems. Aside from the loss of voice, the loss of the natural filtering system of the breathing mechanism presents an adjustment problem. Because air is being taken directly into the trachea without the benefit of being warmed and filtered as formerly, it irritates the mucous membranes. This irritation causes an excessive flow of mucus, excessive coughing, and crusting around the stoma. The first year is usually the worst. The patient often becomes quite concerned, particularly if a few drops of blood appear when he coughs. The therapist must be able to reassure him by explaining the physiological changes which have taken place, without overlooking the need for constant check-ups for recurrence of the malignancy.

If the therapist works with a group he will find that patients bring up many questions, some looking for knowledge, some comparing the particular technique used by different surgeons, and the like. Such questions as those pertaining to sense of smell, to length of time tube must be worn, whether to take it out at night or not, are some of the questions raised. Others may deal with situations

involving vocational status and the therapist may be called in as a consultant to other agencies working toward the rehabilitation of the patient. For example, one patient who was a crane operator and who used a whistle on the job had to be shown how he could adapt the whistle so that he could blow it with the air from the tracheotomy opening instead of between his lips in the accustomed manner.

Probably the greatest psychological problem with which the therapist has to deal is the development of feelings or attitudes of fear, self-pity, or over-protection by the family. The very diagnosis of cancer often paralyzes the patient and he gives up completely with an attitude of "what's the use." Feelings of self-pity and dependence may become so strong that the individual withdraws and has no real desire to learn to communicate in any fashion. Beginning speech therapy as soon after surgery as the doctor permits, often prevents or helps to lessen these barriers to success. The co-operation of the family is a deciding factor in many cases. Over-protection or rejection, either, may cause the patient to give up and not try to learn to talk. The therapist can discuss with the family, and especially the marital partner, the need for helping the patient to practice regularly, to accept his first halting efforts, to give him time and not talk for him, and give other suggestions. Many of these points are quite similar to the kinds of things done for adult aphasics.

The more one works with these people, the more one becomes convinced that the psychological attitudes and emotional adjustments of the patient are the determining factors in therapy. Perfect, fluent speech may depend upon the particular techniques employed by the therapist. But whether the person is motivated to learn esophageal speech for purposes of communication depends not so much upon the therapist as upon the patient's own relationships with other people,—in other words, his general mental health. While such physical factors as type of operation, amount of tissue removed, breathing patterns, may affect the degree of approach to normalcy, they do not in themselves determine the patient's ability or desire to learn this form of communication. Much more research needs to be done in these areas to supplement the mechanical steps we call therapy.

MINUTES

OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND THE BUSINESS MEETINGS OF THE SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION, MEETING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION, APRIL 1-5, 1957.

The first meeting of the Executive Council of the Southern Speech Association was called to order by President Abernathy at 1:30 P.M., Wednesday, April 3, in Room A of the Georgia Center for Continuing Education.

In an effort to establish formal relationships with the State of South Carolina, Abernathy reported that he had received correspondence from Sarah Lowery of an organized group of speech correctionists which might serve as a nucleus for representation on the Executive Council of the Southern Speech Association. Abernathy contacted Arthur Weiss of The South Carolina Association of Speech Therapists, and the President recommended that Stuart Gilmore and Weiss of The Southern Carolina Association of Speech Therapists be seated as the 1957 delegation from South Carolina.

Davis moved (and it was seconded) that the representatives of The South Carolina Association of Speech Therapists (namely, Gilmore and Weiss) be seated as the 1957 delegates from South Carolina to the Executive Council of the Southern Speech Association. Popovich and Ahler inquired if this meant that no other organization could secure representation in the future. The Council agreed that the motion authorized the recognition of the delegates of The South Carolina Association of Speech Therapists for the 1957 convention only. The motion by Davis was passed.

The minutes were read and approved.

The President presented his annual report. Brandes moved that the Council go into the committee of the whole. The motion was seconded and passed. The committee of the whole adjourned. No report was received from the committee. Popovich moved (and it was seconded) that the report of the President be approved. Skinner asked if there were any constitutional limitations on attendance at the tournament and convention. The president replied in the negative. Popovich's motion was passed.

Brandes read the 1957 Report of the Executive Secretary and moved its adoption. The motion was seconded. The recommendations on pp. 2-3 of the report were acted upon as follows: Recommendation #1 was referred, upon a motion by Davis, to consideration by the Finance Committee; Recommendation #2 was postponed, upon a motion by Johnson, to consideration by the Executive

Council on Thursday night; Streeter moved adoption of Recommendation #3 and the Council voted to submit to the business meeting a constitutional amendment to Article III, Section 5, Part B, providing that the executive secretary be made a member ex-officio of the Convention Invitations Committee. Concerning Recommendation #4, Davis moved that a committee of Brandes, Perritt and Streeter be empowered to study the matter of a contract with managers of convention sites and that the committee propose a contract for adoption at the 1958 convention, said proposal to be used in negotiating for the 1959 convention site in Louisville. The motion was seconded and carried.

Brandes requested that all reports by committees and officers be in writing. Abernathy explained that such a request had already been effectuated. Brandes reiterated that all funds collected in the name of the Association should be deposited intact with the Executive Secretary and that bills for expenditures be submitted in writing. No expenditures were to be made out of any funds collected in the name of the association, except by check from the Office of the Executive Secretary. The Council agreed that such was understood.

The report of the Constitution Committee was called for. Johnson responded. Streeter moved acceptance of the report. The President commented that he felt the nature of the amendments in order, since he had felt too confined to working on the convention program rather than looking after the over-all affairs of the Association. Streeter's motion was seconded, and the Council voted to submit the proposed amendments to the business meeting on Friday.

The report on exhibits was called for. Thornton responded, saying that the Association was guaranteed a minimum of \$150 by the Georgia Center and that a written statement would be forthcoming from the Georgia Center. Thornton turned over the files on exhibits to the incoming President, Lewis. The report was accepted with thanks.

The report on the Committee on Invitations was called for. Streeter responded, and moved adoption of his report, a copy of which is attached. The motion was seconded, and the Council voted to recommend to the business meeting that the 1959 convention be held in Louisville, Kentucky.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:06 P.M.

The second meeting of the Executive Council of the Southern Speech Association was called to order by President Abernathy at 9:40 P.M., Wednesday, April 3, in Room A of the Georgia Center for Continuing Education.

The President announced that the report of the Finance Committee would be received on the following evening.

The report of the First-Vice-President was called for. Lewis responded. He noted that the South Carolina group had been seated, and that West Virginia is now officially considered in the Eastern area. It was recommended that a speech teacher in each state be designated to furnish a list of officers of state associations to the Editor of the JOURNAL, the Executive Secretary, the officer charged with organizing the program, and the person responsible for keeping in touch with the regional organizations.

The report of the special committee charged with nominating an Executive Secretary for 1958-1961 was called for. Capel responded. The name of Mary Louise Gehring of Stetson University was placed in nomination by the committee. Capel stated that Gehring's administration had already approved for her sufficient office space and secretarial help. Capel moved that Gehring's name be submitted to the business meeting for approval. The motion was seconded and carried. Brandes asked if Gehring had been advised that the transfer of office would be made on January 16, 1958, and Capel replied in the affirmative.

The report of the Advertising Manager of the JOURNAL was called for. Jeffrey noted that a postcard survey was now in progress to determine what journals other than THE SOUTHERN SPEECH JOURNAL are received by our subscribers. Todd moved the acceptance of Jeffrey's report. The motion was seconded and passed.

The report of the Committee on Local Arrangements was called for. Ballew responded. The problems of exhibits and a contract with the host establishment were discussed.

The report of the Editor of the JOURNAL was called for. Ehninger responded. Particularly noted was the recommendation that the bibliography of speech and theatre be continued. Ehninger moved adoption of his report. The motion was seconded and passed.

The report of the Second Vice-President was called for. Ahler responded and commented on the announcements and letters she had written. She commented that there appeared in some areas a lack of information about the tournament. Two articles were published at her instigation, and a workshop in choral reading was held in Knoxville. A survey was attempted to determine how many high school speech teachers were employed in the Southern region. The results of this attempt are attached to the report of the Second Vice-President. Christophersen recommended writing to the University of South Carolina for the membership in its speech league. Brandes suggested that in order to contact speech teachers in the several states, the state league in each state, plus the state speech association, plus suggestions from the heads of the several speech departments in the state, be solicited. Brandes moved that the Third Vice-President be asked to formulate such a list of high school teachers or sponsors of speech activities by contacting the three sources named above. The motion was seconded and carried.

The report of the Southern Regional AFA Committee was called for. Murphy responded, and a copy of his report is attached. He expressed thanks that the Council had followed the recommendations of the AFA to last year's Council And expressed hope that this year's recommendations would be as well received. Murphy commented that the AFA suggested that the Council reconsider the advisability of using a fresh question in the debate tournament. He commented on the four workshops that were held in conjunction with the tournament and outlined the programs in brief. Murphy moved acceptance of his report. It was seconded and carried. Discussion followed on the merits of using the national question in the tournament. Murphy moved we continue the national question for another two years and that two rounds of experimental debate be included. The motion was seconded and carries, 12-1.

The report of the Third Vice-President was called for. Streeter responded. The report is in two parts: (1) a summary of the year's activities and (2) an outline of the duties of the office. Streeter moved acceptance of his report. The motion was seconded and passed. Considerable discussion followed.

The report of the Nominations Committee was called for. Shirley responded. Murphy moved that the report be accepted. The motion was seconded and passed, and the slate of officers was approved for recommendation to the General Session. Johnson asked about the nomination of members for the Legislative Assembly of the SAA. Dickey, Shirley, and Gehring commented that this had already been done, and Brandes pointed out that the nominating committee forwards its names directly to the nominating committee of the SAA without clearing its nominations with the Southern Speech Association.

The report of the Committee on Speech Education was called for. Gehring responded and moved acceptance of her report. The motion was seconded and passed.

The report of the Committee on History and Archives was called for. Dickey reported that a three-drawer filing cabinet full of records had been accumulated. Auer moved to accept Dickey's report with special thanks. The motion was seconded and carried.

Brandes moved that the Third Vice-President draw up a detailed summary of the tournament and congress to be sent to each school participating and to be condensed for consideration by the Editor of the JOURNAL. The motion was seconded and carried.

The report of the Southern Regional Speech and Hearing Disorders Committee was called for. Johnson responded for Backus who was on leave from the University of Alabama. Mader, it was pointed out, had left the Southern region. Harold Luper, Johnson commented will remain as a committee member. The Council named T. Earle Johnson and Genieve Arnold to the Committee for one and two year terms respectively, in retrospect, for the year 1956-1957.

The report of the Southern Regional AETA Committee was called for. White responded. Auer moved acceptance of the report. It was seconded and passed.

The meeting was adjourned.

* * * *

The first business meeting of the Southern Speech Association was called to order by President Abernathy in the Auditorium of the Georgia Center for Continuing Education, at 1:30 P.M., Thursday, April 4, 1957.

Abernathy announced that the first order of business was the election of a nominating committee for 1957-1958. Ballots were distributed, in accordance with Article I, Section I of the By Laws. Christophersen, Davis and McGlon were appointed as tellers and asked to report to the second business meeting on Friday the results of the election.

The report of the Executive Secretary was read. Brandes moved adoption of the report. The motion was seconded and carried.

The report of the Third Vice-President was read. Streeter reported 49 schools in attendance, with 1242 speeches given, and \$386 in fees collected so far.

Streeter made the report of the Convention Invitations Committee, as approved by the Executive Council. Streeter moved acceptance of the recommendation the 1959 convention be held in Louisville. The motion was seconded and carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 P.M.

The third meeting of the Executive Council of the Southern Speech Association convened at 9:00 P.M., Thursday, April 4, in Room 4 of the Georgia Center for Continuing Education.

There was further consideration of the report of the AETA Committee. It was pointed out that Leighton had been appointed chairman of the committee. Auer moved adoption of the report. The motion was seconded and passed. It was recommended to the committee on committees that consideration be given to the recommendation of the AETA in appointing new committee members.

Abernathy called for suggestions for next year's committees and the incoming president noted the names mentioned.

The report of the special tournament committee, authorized in the minutes of the 1956 convention, was called for. Johnson responded for Hagood. The committee had been constituted on Bill Dibrell, Bill Smith, Joe Wetherby, Helen Lochrie, and the chairman, Mrs. Hagood. In August, Hagood had sent out a report to the members of the committee. Jeffrey moved receipt of the report. Jeffrey's motion was seconded and carried. Ehninger moved that the tournament committee be continued, that its personnel be reconstituted, that the Executive Secretary be made an ex-officio member of the committee, and that it be charged not only with reporting

in 1957 to the Executive Council but that it advise the Third Vice-President of desirable tournament changes so that the Third Vice-President might instigate those changes at his discretion. The motion was seconded and carried.

Johnson suggested an amendment to Article II, Officers, providing that the Third Vice-President be elected a year in advance of the time at which he assumed office and should serve as an assistant to the incumbent of the office for the tournament immediately following his election. Skinner moved adoption of the amendment. The motion was seconded and passed, to be recommended to the association at the second business meeting.

The report of the Finance Committee was called for. Lewis responded saying that the Committee had met with the Executive Secretary and recommended approval of the budget to the business meeting. The motion was seconded and passed.

The report of the Convention Proceedings Committee was called for. Nan Elkins responded. Elkins asked what was to be the disposal of the report. Following discussion, Christophersen moved that the report of the proceedings be made a part of the file of the Executive Secretary and that the length of the report be left to the discretion of the chairman of the Convention Proceedings Committee. The motion was seconded. Hart moved to amend the motion by adding after the words, "at the discretion of the chairman of the Convention Proceedings Committee," the words, "and the report or portions thereof may be published by the Editor of the JOURNAL at his discretion." The amendment was seconded and carried. The main motion as amended was carried.

Brandes moved that the Council go into the committee of the whole. The motion was seconded and passed. Upon the dissolution of the whole, there was no report.

Lewis recommended that the Executive Secretary be empowered to purchase a filing cabinet in which could be housed the important papers of the office. The motion was seconded and passed for submission to the second business meeting.

Abernathy called for consideration of the Recommendation #2 of the Executive Secretary. Hollis Todd of Mississippi College and J. J. Auer of the University of Virginia thought they might have housing for the back issues of the JOURNAL. Discussion followed, and it was agreed that the Council looked with favor upon the idea and suggested that the Executive Secretary implement it at his discretion.

Johnson suggested that Article II, Section I, be amended to permit the Advertising Manager of the JOURNAL to be a part of the Executive Council. Ehninger moved adoption of the amendment. It was seconded and passed for submission to the second business meeting.

The President closed with his thanks to the Council for its co-operation. The meeting was adjourned.

* * * *

The second Business Meeting of the 1957 Convention of the Southern Speech Association was called to order by President Abernathy at 1:30 P.M., Friday, April 5, in the auditorium of the Georgia Center for Continuing Education.

Christophersen reported that Chloe Armstrong, Giles Gray, Mary Louise Gehring, Gilbert Hartwig, and Frank Davis had been named to the nominating committee, with Davis as chairman.

Lewis reported for the Finance Committee. Auer moved that the proposed budget for 1957-1958 be approved. The motion was seconded and carried. Dicky moved that the Executive Secretary be authorized to purchase a steel filing cabinet, in keeping with the recommendation of the Executive Council. The motion was seconded and carried.

Phifer reported for the Congress of Human Relations. 15 colleges, entering 53 delegates, and 11 high schools, entering 46 delegates, were registered. Thanks were extended to Phifer for his contribution.

Reynolds reported for the Resolutions Committee. Auer moved that the report be accepted. The motion was seconded and passed.

The report of the Constitution Committee was made by Johnson. The amendments to Article V, Duties of Officers, and Article III of the By-Laws Section 5, Sub-Sections D, E, and F, as well as the amendments to Article II, Officers; Article III of the By-Laws, Committees, Section 5; and Article III, Executive Council, Section 1 were submitted. Johnson moved adoption of each, and in their turn; each amendment was seconded and carried.

Davis moved to reconsider the report of the Resolutions Committee. The motion was seconded and carried. Davis moved to add a 6th resolution, thanking Edson Marshall for his speech of Wednesday night. The motion was seconded and carried.

Shirley reported for the nominating committee, a copy of the report being attached. McGlon moved adoption of the report. The motion was seconded and carried.

Abernathy presented a gavel to the Association. It was gratefully received by incoming President Lewis. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
P. D. Brandes,
Executive Secretary

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION
STATEMENT OF CONDITION
ASSETS

	January 16, 1956	January 16, 1957	Increase Or Decrease*
Current Assets:			
Bonds: First Federal Savings and Loan Association, Tuscaloosa, Alabama	\$ 700.00	\$ 700.00	\$ 0.00
Cash: Citizens Bank, Hattiesburg, Miss.	\$ 132.00	\$ 963.60	\$ 831.60
Accounts Receivable:			
Winter, 1954	\$ 40.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 40.00*
Spring, 1955	40.00	0.00	40.00*
Fall, 1955	103.00	16.00	87.00*
Winter, 1955	224.00	4.00	220.00*
Spring, 1956	0.00	4.00	4.00
Summer, 1956	0.00	28.00	28.00
Fall, 1956	0.00	8.00	8.00
Winter, 1956	0.00	247.00	247.00
Subscriptions and Back Issues	247.50	445.60	198.10
Miscellaneous Receivables	0.00	9.00	9.00
Total Accounts Receivables	\$ 654.50	\$ 761.60	\$ 107.10
Fixed Assets:			
Membership Card File	\$ 240.84	\$ 240.84	\$ 0.00
Typewriter (Editor)	90.92	90.92	0.00
Total Fixed Assets	\$ 331.76	\$ 331.76	\$ 0.00
TOTAL ASSETS	\$1,818.26	\$2,756.96	\$ 938.70

LIABILITIES AND SURPLUS

Current Liabilities:			
Convention Press—Printing			
Winter Edition	\$ 766.48	\$ 605.81	\$ 160.67*
Refundable Tournament Fees	0.00	30.00	30.00
Standard Office Supply			
Company	4.50	0.00	4.50*
Hub Printing Company	47.00	0.00	47.00*
M.S.C. Bookstore	1.60	2.75	1.15
M.S.C. Production Theatre	0.00	4.20	4.20
Total Current Liabilities	\$819.58	\$ 642.76	\$ 176.92*
Surplus	\$ 998.68	\$2,114.20	\$1,115.52
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND SURPLUS	\$1,818.26	\$2,756.96	\$ 938.70

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION
SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
For Period Begun January 16, 1956 And Ended January 16, 1957

	Budget For Fiscal Year	Actual Receipts	Actual Over or Under*
REVENUES			
Membership Dues:			
Regular	\$ 400.00	\$ 464.00	\$ 64.00
Sustaining	950.00	1,035.00	85.00
Library	200.00	231.35	31.35
Student	20.00	5.00	15.00*
Total Membership Dues	\$1,570.00	\$1,735.35	\$ 165.35
Advertising, Journal			
January, 1956		\$ 124.00	
February, 1956		231.00	
March, 1956		45.00	
April, 1956		48.00	
May, 1956		226.00	
July, 1956		76.00	
August, 1956		16.00	
October, 1956		16.00	
November, 1956		76.00	
December, 1956		136.00	
January, 1957		15.00	
Total Advertising	\$ 750.00	\$1,009.00	\$ 258.00
1956 Convention Income:			
Convention Fees	\$ 120.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 65.00*
Tournament Income	400.00	495.00	95.00
Exhibits	75.00	95.00	20.00
Total Convention Income	\$ 595.00	\$ 645.00	\$ 50.00
Other Income:			
Forensic Banquet	\$ 0.00	\$ 252.95	\$ 252.95
SSA Banquet	0.00	167.20	167.20
Sale of Back Issues	200.00	145.30	54.70*
Grant From University of Florida	700.00	700.00	0.00
Theatre Tickets	0.00	35.35	35.35
Interest Income	19.25	21.00	1.75
Miscellaneous Income	0.00	43.39	43.39
Total Other Income	\$ 919.25	\$1,365.19	\$ 445.94
TOTAL REVENUES	\$3,834.25	\$4,754.54	\$ 920.29
Add Cash In Bank, January 16, 1956		132.00	
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR DISBURSEMENT		\$4,886.54	

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION
SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
(Continued)

For Period Begun January 16, 1956 And Ended January 16, 1957

EXPENDITURES:

	Budget For Fiscal Year	Actual Receipts	Actual Over or Under*
Printing and Binding, Journal			
February, 1956		\$ 300.00	
March, 1956		466.48	
May, 1956		659.25	
July, 1956		531.12	
October, 1956		629.64	
Total Printing and Binding	\$3,000.00	\$2,586.49	\$ 413.51*
Executive Secretary Office Expense:			
Office Supplies and Postage	\$ 175.00	\$ 343.26	\$ 168.26
Printing	75.00	0.00	75.00*
Total Executive Secretary Office	\$ 250.00	\$ 343.26	\$ 93.26
1956 Convention Expense:			
Congress—Tournament	\$ 150.00	\$ 105.79	\$ 44.21*
Programs	110.00	115.00	5.00
Printing Certificates	0.00	159.52	159.52
Workshops	75.00	0.00	75.00*
Badges	20.00	41.80	21.80
Total Convention Expenses	\$ 355.00	\$ 422.11	\$ 67.11
1956 Banquet Expense:			
Theatre Tickets	\$ 0.00	\$ 31.15	\$ 31.15
SSA Banquet	0.00	175.69	175.69
Forensic Banquet	0.00	272.00	272.00
Decorations	0.00	39.24	39.24
Total Banquet Expense	\$ 0.00	\$ 518.08	\$ 518.08
Miscellaneous Expenses:			
Bank Service Charges	\$	\$ 3.51	\$ 3.51
Bank Exchange Charges		.90	.90
Shipping Expense	150.00	48.59	101.41*
Total Miscellaneous Expenses	\$ 150.00	\$ 53.00	\$ 97.00*
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$3,755.00	\$3,922.94	\$ 167.94
Add Cash in Bank, January 16, 1957		963.60	
TOTAL FUNDS ACCOUNTED FOR		\$4,886.54	

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION

PROPOSED BUDGET

For the Fiscal Year Ending January 16, 1958

REVENUES:

Convention:

Registration	\$ 70.00	
Exhibits	100.00	
Tournament—Congress	500.00	\$ 670.00

Memberships:

Sustaining:	\$1,000.00	
Regular	450.00	
Library	250.00	1,700.00

Southern Speech Journal:

Advertising	\$1,000.00	
Sale of Back Issues	50.00	1,050.00

Grant From The University of Florida 700.00

Miscellaneous Income:

Interest Income		21.00
-----------------	--	-------

TOTAL REVENUES

\$4,141.00

EXPENDITURES:

Convention:

Programs	\$ 120.00	
Badges	20.00	
Tournament—Congress	150.00	\$ 290.00

Southern Speech Journal

3,000.00

Officers and Committees:

Postage and Supplies	\$ 250.00	
Printing	100.00	
Workshops	75.00	425.00

TOTAL EXPENDITURES

\$3,715.00

ESTIMATED INCREASE IN SURPLUS

\$ 426.00



NEWS AND NOTES

DON STREETER

NEW APPOINTMENTS:

New appointments at The University of Mississippi include, Dr. Lucia C. Morgan, Correction, Dr. Clyde Reeves, Forensics, Mr. Thomas Evans, Technical Theater, Mr. Charles Harbour, Theater and Fundamentals.

Mrs. Beulah Lyon, special instructor at the University of Texas, resigned at the close of the 1956-57 school year to accept a position as Assistant Dean of Girls at the American School in Istanbul, Turkey.

Roy Vanhoove, instructor at the University of Texas, resigned at the end of the year to go to the University of Iowa to begin advanced graduate study.

New appointments in the Department of Speech at the University of Florida include Donald A. Harrington, Associate Professor; John W. Kirk, Instructor, and Gerald R. Mohrmann, Instructor.

Dr. J. B. Ranney, formerly of Ohio Northern University, has been appointed head of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at Auburn.

Dr. Otis Walter has resigned from the University of Houston to accept a position as Professor of Rhetoric at the University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Robert L. Scott has resigned from the University of Houston to take charge of the Debate program at the University of Minnesota.

Dr. Don Streeter left Memphis State University to accept the chairmanship of the Department of Speech at the University of Houston.

Bradford White has been named Acting Chairman of the Department of Speech and Drama at Memphis State University.

Mrs. Lea Gibbs Park has completed her M.A. at Memphis State University, and has joined the staff of the Department of Speech and Drama there.

MISCELLANEOUS:

The University of Mississippi produced *The Family Reunion*, *Right You Are*, and *Hippolytus* during the summer, Dr. Charles M. Getchell directing.

Mr. Jay Sanders, Instructor of Radio and Television at Auburn spent the summer at Northwestern University in Northwestern's Television program.

Dr. Howard W. Townsend, Associate Professor, University of Texas, was elected to membership on the Legislative Assembly of the Speech Association of America to take office on Jan. 1, 1958. He taught for Dr. Robert Capel at Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches, Texas, during the first term of the summer. He spent the remainder of the summer at the University of Southern California.

Mrs. Eva G. Currie, instructor in speech for foreign speaking persons at the University of Texas, conducted an orientation and English language program during July and August for foreign professional people (doctors, lawyers, teachers, etc.) who will later go to hospitals, schools, etc., in this country to observe and study in their own line of work for a year.

Thirty students from eleven countries attended the fifth annual English Language Institute held at the University of Florida, June 28-August 30. The program was under the general direction of C. K. Thomas of Cornell University, who was on the Florida campus as visiting professor of speech. He was assisted by Jayne Crane Harder of Youngstown University, and by two graduate assistants, Oneida Carpenter and Gresdna Galloway. The Institute provides intensive instruction in written and spoken English, and is designed to enable foreign students to participate successfully in college courses conducted in English and to adjust adequately to an American-English speaking community.

Mrs. A. Ray Battin of the University of Houston, is continuing a program started last year, in teaching speech to foreign students. The course is a regularly scheduled class, carrying college credit, and it lasts for a year. Student personnel has consisted mainly of foreign students studying Petroleum Engineering.

Dr. Lester L. Hale, who has been on leave from the University of Florida for the past year conducting a survey on the methods of teaching the beginning speech course at Ohio University, has now returned to the University of Florida and has assumed his duties as Dean of Men.

A group of former students at Memphis State University and the University of Mississippi organized a stock company, called The Front Street Theatre, and produced a series of six plays during the summer. The program was a financial success as well as receiving the acclaim of critics, so they plan to do it again next year with an expanded company of actors.

The University of Florida produced *An Inspector Calls* last summer.

Dr. Stanley Hamilton, Chairman of the Department of Drama at the University of Houston, tells us that *The Desperate Hours* was the first production of the year.

Mr. John Van Meter returned from leave of absence to resume his duties on the teaching staff of the Department of Speech, University of Florida.

The play production at Memphis State for the season 1957-1958 includes the following: *THE CHALK GARDEN*, *RUMPLESTILTSKIN*, *BUS STOP*, and the Seventh Annual Memphis Shakespeare Festival production, *A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM*. The Music and Speech Departments will cooperate in the production of Mozart's opera *COSI FAN TUTTI*. The drama program is under the direction of Eugene Bence, Bradford White, Lea Park, and Floyd Herzog.



Book Reviews

M. BLAIR HART

EXPLORATIONS IN AWARENESS. By J. Samuel Bois. New York Harper & Brothers, 1957; pp 212; \$2.75.

Explorations in Awareness is an unpretentious book that will delight those who have never read, but have been curious about Korzybski's *Science and Sanity*; it will awaken memories of mild irritation and moments of brilliant insight for those who, before his death in 1953, had the opportunity of attending one of Korzybski's seminars. It will serve as a guide and inspiration for those who would like to discuss the fundamentals of general semantics in the classroom, or in the community. *Explorations in Awareness* begins as an account of the author's attempt to understand the essence of Korzybski's major work; it turns out to be an amazingly skillful presentation of those ideas in a stimulating and readable framework of 31 brief chapters which flow together as smoothly as a novel. It is inspirational without being preachy; it is serious without being pedantic.

Dr. Bois, a Canadian industrial psychologist and management consultant, has written from a background of practical experience. He has used the principles of general semantics in the training of business executives. The breadth of his personal interests is reflected in a bibliography of eighty references that range all the way from E. A. Abbott's *Flatland*, through D. H. Lawrence's *Selected Poems* and Stanislovski's *An Actor Prepares*, to George Zipf's *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort*.

I have noted this unusual bibliography because it emphasizes a rather significant point made in the text: "There were many years in which I rebelled against Korzybski's insistence on 'consciousness of abstracting' as the main aim of his work. . . . I blamed the old man for being a cut-and-dried epistemologist, exclusively concerned with the brain, and brothering very little with emotions, feelings, and moral values." The manner in which Dr. Bois analyses his own mis-interpretation of Korzybski's intent, and the resulting insights, is one of the delightful contributions of the book. "Reading a book is a matter of getting acquainted with its key terms: what they are, where they come from, what they are expected to do in the context, how they interact with one another, how they combine in meaningful patterns." It is at this point that the author not only finds the source of his own blundering, but it is the point at which he writes most lucidly for the uninitiated reader.

Chapter VII introduces the key term "semantic reactions." From this springboard Dr. Bois moves with poise through the necessary technical terminology, sometimes quoting Korzybski, sometimes introducing his own modi-

fication of basic terms. Carefully chosen illustrations are a significant aid in visualizing many of the abstract terms. The concluding chapters highlight the author's discovery that the disciplines of general semantics *are* vitally concerned with "emotions, feelings and moral values."

Some readers will accept Dr. Bois's opening assertion that "the following pages contain nothing that is really new." Other will find it a source of fresh insight and inspiration.

M. B. H.

THE HARPER HANDBOOK OF COMMUNICATION SKILLS. By C. Merton Babcock. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957; pp. xiv + 489. \$3.50.

Many of us have taught reading, writing, speaking and listening in colleges and universities where these skills are integrated. And many of us have worked on a local syllabus. Now Merton Babcock has put a handbook on the market that comes from his years of work at Michigan State University where he was editor of the Communication Skills syllabus of that University. There are three points that impress me especially: (1) the organization of the content of the book; (2) the exercises; and (3) the system of identification used.

First, the book is divided into two main portions. One part deals with the four elements of communication, and the other is a type of writer's handbook, called Reference Guides. These guides are the usual rules regarding diction, paragraphs, sentence structure, grammar and the mechanics of writing, plus many sensible suggestions on logical fallacies and affective devices.

It is in the first portion of the book that the distinctive contribution is made. There are five parts. They begin with an analysis of the processes of communication, a chapter on the communicator, and another on the uses of language. The second part is about ideas, facts, and purpose in communication. The third takes up organization of ideas into patterns and the processes of persuasion. The fourth brings the writer's or speaker's audience up for analysis. And the fifth offers suggestions on acquiring the skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

He has resisted any desire to make this a combination of our traditional courses in English composition, public speaking, and essay reading. Instead, he has discussed communication as a process involving a speaker-writer, a reader-listener, a speech-composition, and an occasion. And he has done it in a style which is bright, clear, and interesting. The illustrative material is brief and intrinsically interesting, with the point under consideration easily found.

In this early half of the book Babcock shows more interest in ideas than in word choice or grammar; more interest in ideas than in the oral presentation of those ideas.

The exercises at the ends of the chapters are another fine feature of the book. There is a manual which has been prepared, but I feel that the text alone could be used successfully by most teachers. Often our problem in communication skills courses has been that our teachers were trained in the disciplines of either Speech or English, and in a small school where producing one's own syllabus was impossible, the course bogged down for lack of exercises covering all the skills. Here they are, and very good ones. They are within the experiential range of the beginning college student. They ask

the student to read what he normally reads: magazines, newspapers, textbooks; to speak about events he has seen, books he has read, problems he has considered; to listen to what he normally listens to: radio and TV, campus lecturers, classroom teacher, classroom speeches; and to write about what he has experienced: criticism of campus plays, reviews of books he has read, essays on ideas he is trying to clarify, and pleas for a solution to a problem.

The symbols used for identification are an aid to the student and to the teacher. At the top outside corner of each page is a large bold-face numeral, recording the number of the chapter and the number of the topic treated on that page. For example, 14.4 deals with group discussion, and 8.2 is on deduction. In the Reference Guides S-2 deals with sentence length, and M-3 is about the mechanics of the period, question mark, and exclamation point. Inside the back covers is a quick glance table to the reference guides; inside the front cover is a graph for a glance at what is in the five parts of the first portion of the book.

The binding is a soft cloth, black, with bands of color across the middle. The paper is a good quality, dull nish. The type is easy to read. There are no pictures, and only a few graphs, charts, and facsimiles.

Teachers will like working with this handbook.

DON STREETER

University of Houston

THE ART OF PERSUASION. By Wayne C. Minnick. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957; pp. vii + 295. \$4.00.

Traditionally, writers in the field of speech have approached "persuasion" *substantively*, conceiving of it as a body of loosely integrated "psychological" of pathetic proofs—suggestion, motive appeal, use of loaded language, and the like. The significance of Minnick's book, as I see it, is that he discards this customary pattern and approaches "persuasion" functionally, treating it as "a democratic technique for resolving controversy through the expression of majority opinion after consideration of conflicting views."

From this fresh interpretation, "persuasion" emerges not as the mere counterpart of "conviction," but as a broad social tool for arriving at public decisions. Indeed, in scope and importance it parallels the methods of "authority" and "reflective group inquiry," and for a number of reasons, as the author believes, is generally superior to either. Moreover, in keeping with this wider role, it appropriately includes all of the various sorts of artistic and inartistic proofs, as well as matters of organization, style, and delivery—everything, in fact, that a speaker may say or do in an effort to shape the opinions and control the actions of others.

Out of this complex of dispositional and stylistic, as well as inventional elements, operationally conceived, Minnick constructs what he calls "the complete process of persuasion." Grounded in "field theory," with its assumed interplay of organic and environmental factors, this process consists of five separate but inter-dependent steps: securing and holding attention, insuring accurate perception, winning belief, relating the communication to the needs and values of the audience, and overcoming obstacles to action.

These steps, discussed in order, determine the general framework of the book, with one or more chapters being devoted to each. Everywhere a

co
fo
wo
sta
the
cha

the
"w
vai
and
pri

in
Mi
dis
suc
of
clu
app
self
Fro
def
it v

pro
tra
"att
kep
Styl
prel
Beli
a fr
iarit
pro
ence
The
fict
of f
chap
to A
deve

C
well
than
final
whil
high
basie
to b

Univ

conscientious effort is made to base both theory and precept upon a solid foundation of experimental data drawn from the latest research findings of workers in the fields of psychology and speech. And while in a few instances conclusions appear to be erected upon rather meager evidence, for the most part the effort is successful, so that what we have is not mere arm-chair speculation but empirically verified validated persuasion theory.

Among the many noteworthy features of the book should be mentioned the excellent discussion of "analogy," the placing of "values" alongside "wants" as crucial determinants of action, the careful separation of "motivation" and "emotion," the playing down of the correlation between "desire" and "belief," and the uniformly excellent examples and illustrations, drawn principally from contemporary speeches.

Insofar as questions arise they would seem to center in two areas. First, in extending the scope of "persuasion" and giving it a functional orientation Minnick may well have caused it to lose something of its character as a discrete discipline—as a doctrinal and pedagogical unit separable from other such units and capable of being studied and taught as an independent body of knowledge. With logical and ethical, no less than pathetic proofs included within its province, and with matters of disposition and style also appropriated, "persuasion" takes practically all of suasive rhetoric unto itself, and instead of borrowing from the parent science tends to replace it. From the point of view of theory this monism may, of course, be stoutly defended by reference to contemporary psychology and logic. How teachable it will prove in the classroom remains to be seen.

As a second question, it may be suggested that Minnick's functional approach sometimes makes for a rather unconvincing reordering of certain traditional subject-elements. Thus, for example, "suggestion" is treated under "attention," on the ground that it is most effective "when attention can be kept sharply enough focused to exclude irrelevant or antagonistic ideas. . . ." Style is dealt with twice: once in connection with "perception," since comprehension is impaired by "ambiguity," and again in the chapter "Winning Belief: Personal Experience," since "the obligation of the speaker to recreate a fragment of experience . . . requires him to have at least a passing familiarity with the aims and methods of the literary artist." The standard approaches to a hostile audience—common ground, etc.—come not under audience analysis or speech organization, but in the chapter "Winning Belief: The Opinion of Others," the argument being that they grow out of a conflict of speaker and audience interest. And, most surprising of all, the analysis of the audience and organization of the speech are discussed in successive chapters under the general head of "Discovering and Overcoming Obstacles to Action," with the result that they appear not as constructive aids to the development of proofs, but rather as strategies for circumventing roadblocks.

Clearly, these reorderings are the result of pioneering effort, and it may well be that over a period of time they will come to seem more convincing than they do at present. Here, as in the case of the broadened scope, the final test is the pragmatic one, and must be made in the classroom. Meanwhile, Minnick is to be congratulated for having written a different and a highly provocative book. Whether teachers will agree or disagree with its basic doctrines, they will certainly want to see it, and they can hardly fail to be stimulated by much they will find within its pages.

DOUGLAS EHNINGER

University of Florida

THE REHABILITATION OF SPEECH. By Robert West, Merle Aansberry, and Anna Carr. Third Edition. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957; pp. 676; \$7.50.

This third edition of *The Rehabilitation of Speech*, which the authors intend to be supplemented by the second edition, contains a wealth of technical information. It is highly professional and scientific in tone, and establishes the science of speech correction on a solid basis. It is well organized and is marked throughout by careful definition of terms. The sections on neurophysiology are particularly noteworthy. Specific additions include increased attention to aphasia and expansion of the sections on hearing. Emphasis is placed on the physical aspects of speech and hearing disorders, although the recognition of concepts such as the "whole individual" and the "team approach" is made. The material on psychogenic cases is relatively brief and should be supplemented by coverage in other texts. Experienced therapists and students alike will find the glossary valuable.

ROSEMARY C. PFEIFER

University of Arkansas

COMPETITIVE DEBATE: RULES AND TECHNIQUES. Third Edition. By George McCoy Musgrave. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1957; pp. 170. \$2.50.

The third edition of this controversial debate handbook, which first appeared in 1945 under the title *Competitive Debate: Rules and Strategy*, incorporates a number of notable changes and additions. Most significant of the modifications are the recodification of the so-called rules of debate (first codified in the 1945 edition), the fuller treatment of cross examination, and the streamlining of case organization and judging procedure. There are also noteworthy additions: a new chapter on forensic administration, an appendix tabulating national topics and national tournament winners, and a fresh, annotated bibliography.

Professor Musgrave's second-thoughts have resulted in a general improvement of his handbook. Much of the present revision is indeed bracing. Moreover, the author deserves special credit for his careful refinement and elaboration of the "rules" of debate.

On the other side of the coin. Though the term "strategy" has been cut out of the sub-title, the handbook's emphasis on "strategic debating" still remains. It may well be doubted that the strategic approach (i.e. "Outwitting" one's opponent through ingenious and cleverly executed "tricks") is to be preferred to the so-called "straightforward approach" (in the author's terminology, "Conventional debating"), which stresses above all else sound analysis and logical adequacy of case.

In this reviewer's judgement, therefore, the real worth of Professor Musgrave's handbook still resides (after a second revision) in its opening chapter, "Rules of Debate."

RALPH T. EUBANKS

University of Arkansas

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION
SUSTAINING MEMBERS
November 7, 1957

ALABAMA

ANNISTON

Anniston City Schools:
Loretta G. Brown

AUBURN

Alabama Polytechnic Institute:
Frank B. Davis
William P. Dorné
Donald Harrington
Mary V. Moore
William S. Smith

BIRMINGHAM

2003 22nd St.:
Rose B. Johnson
Jr. League & Hearing Center:
Frances M. Meeks
Birmingham Southern College:
M. Fred Evans
Howard College:
G. Allan Yeomans
University Medical Center:
John E. Paul

BLOOM

Florence Pass

COLUMBIANA

Shelby Co. High School:
Barbara Joiner

FLORENCE

Florence State Teachers College:
Edward E. Matis

MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE

Joseph H. Mahaffey
F. A. Cartier

MOBILE

Day School for the Deaf:
May G. Carlin
United Cerebral Palsy Center:
Margaret A. Crary

MONTEVALLO

108 Highland:
A. J. Kochman
Alabama College:
Patricia Clithero
John B. Ellery
Sara M. Ivey
Laura F. Wright

ALABAMA—Continued
TUSCALOOSA

1407 University Ave.:
Elizabeth F. Carnell
G. Mitchell Carnell, Jr.

UNIVERSITY

University of Alabama:
Ollie L. Backus
Allen Bales
Frances Beckelheimer
Lillian O. Dubin
Mary V. Dearstone
Annabel Hagood
Marion Gallaway
T. Earle Johnson
Rebecca Ragsdale
Lewis I. Raimist
H. Hardy Perritt
Louise M. Ward
Bettie L. Warren
Elizabeth Webster

ARKANSAS

CLARKVILLE

College of the Ozarks:
Fred Koontz

CONWAY

Arkansas State Teachers College:
Mary K. Sands
Leona Scott

FAYETTEVILLE

University of Arkansas:
Virgil L. Baker
Blair M. Hart

FORT SMITH

Ft. Smith High School:
Mrs. John A. Holt

LITTLE ROCK

Central High School:
Marguerite P. Metcalf
Alberta Harris

SEARCY

Harding College:
Evan Ulrey

FLORIDA

CORAL GABLES

University of Miami:
Eugene White

FLORIDA—Continued

DELAND

Stetson University:

Mary L. Gehring

Charles C. Ritter

DUNEDIN

Pinella County Sp. Therapist:

Barbara A. Hardin

GAINESVILLE

University of Florida:

H. P. Constans

Robt. L. Christ

Dallas C. Dickey

Douglas W. Ehninger

Richard D. Hutto

Margaret C. McClellan

Jeanne Miles

W. M. Parrish

Alma Sarett

L. L. Zimmerman

JACKSONVILLE

Robert E. Lee High School:

Eunice Horne

LAKELAND

Florida Southern College:

Mrs. F. H. Callahan

Mildred Ibberson

MIAMI

Jackson High School:

Bertha Hunt

Miami Beach High School:

Nancy J. Weir

PENSACOLA

Naval School of Aviation Medicine:

Gilbert C. Tolhurst

ST. PETERSBURG

St. Petersburg Junior College:

Roberta Buchanan

TALLAHASSEE

Florida State University:

Wade W. Banks

Paul W. Davee

G. Don Davidson

C. W. Edney

Thomas R. King

Thomas R. Lewis

Gregg Phifer

L. L. Schendel

TAMPA

Florida Christian College:

Bob F. Owen

WARRINGTON

535 S. Barrancas St.:

Mrs. Ada G. Weisinger

GEORGIA

ATHENS

University of Georgia:

Stanley Ainsworth

Wm. E. Brand

Paul Camp

Arthur J. Fear

Harold Luper

Jerry Maddox

James E. Popovich

Carlton S. Smith

David B. Strother

ATLANTA

Davison School of Speech

Correction:

Louise Davison

Emory University:

George A. Neely

Jr. League School of Speech

Correction:

Virginia C. Baird

State Department of Education:

Mamia J. Jones

AUGUSTA

Univ. of Ga. Center:

Morris P. Wolf

COLLEGEBORO

Ga. Teachers Col.:

Doroth Few

DECATUR

Agnes Scott College:

Roberta Winter

GAINESVILLE

Gainesville Public Schools:

Mary M. McCaslin

MACON

Mercer University:

Helen G. Thornton

Wesleyan Conservatory:

Mary Pate

Ruth Simonson

STATESBORO

701 E. Jones Ave.

Robert Overstreet

VALDOSTA

Valdosta State College:

Louise A. Sawyer

ILLINOIS

Monmouth 115 S. B. St.:

Louise A. Sawyer

Sidell, Jamaica High School:

Marvin L. Tuttle

IOWA

IOWA CITY

University of Iowa:

Orville Hitchcock

IOWA—Continued

WAVERLY

Wartburg College:

Robt. G. Smith

Iowa State University:

Obra Quave

KANSAS

MANHATTAN

Kansas State College:

John L. Robson

KENTUCKY

GEORGETOWN

Georgetown College:

Rena Calhoun

Orlin R. Corey

HOPKINSVILLE

Hopkinsville High School:

Eugene Gough

LEXINGTON

Lafayette Sr. High School:

Thelma Beeler

St. Cripple Children Commission:

Mary L. McDowell

LOUISVILLE

*Southern Baptist Theological**Seminary:*

Charles McClon

MOREHEAD

Morehead High School:

James E. Davis

MURRAY

Murray State College:

J. Albert Tracy

RICHMONT

Eastern Kentucky State College:

Pearl Buchanan

WILMORE

Asbury College:

Gladys Greathouse

WINCHESTER

Winchester High School:

Mrs. Neville McCracken

Mrs. Rich. Sanderson

LOUISIANA

BATON ROUGE

Louisiana State University:

Waldo W. Braden

Clinton Bradford

C. Cordelia Brong

Giles W. Gray

Francine Merritt

Owen M. Peterson

LOUISIANA—Continued

Claude Shaver

Wesley Wiksell

GRAMBLING

Grambling College:

Floyd L. Sandle

LAFAYETTE

Southern Louisiana Institute:

Norman Attenhoffer

Roy D. Murphy

H. Waldo Wasson

MONROE

3503 De Sirad:

George C. Brian

Neville High School:

Sammy R. Danna

NATCHITOCHES

Northwestern State College:

Edna West

Irma Stockwell

NEW ORLEANS

3939 Gentilly Blvd.:

Thomas L. Tedford

*Orleans Parish Corrective Speech**Dep't.:*

Alida Dureau

Rosemary Calongne

Lorretto Burke

Tulane University:

Robert W. Corrigan

Maurice Joseph

Jeannette Laguaite

Monroe Lippman

PINEVILLE

Louisiana College:

DeWitte T. Holland

MARYLAND

ANNAPOLIS

Kennedy Point:

Mark H. Von Redlich

MICHIGAN

EAST LANSING

Mich. State Univ.:

Donald H. Ecroyd

Thomas R. Long

MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota:

Robert L. Scott

MISSISSIPPI

CLINTON

Mississippi College:
Hollis B. Todd
Mrs. H. B. Todd
John W. Wills

COLUMBUS

Mississippi State College for Women:
Harvey Cromwell

FRENCH CAMP

French Camp Academy:
A. M. Jones

HATTIESBURG

Mississippi Southern College:
Paul Brandes
Marilyn Brown
Robert B. Cade
Don George
Gilbert Hartwig
Robt. L. McCroskey
Roland Oesterreich
Robert Peters
Peggy J. Revels
Robert M. Treser
M. L. Turney
Gerard Wagner
Wm. Carey College:
Clara Axie Dyer

HAZELHURST

Hazelhurst High School:
Joyce Nicholson

JACKSON

Central High School:
Emmy Lou Patton
Provine High School:
Sue Longest

LONG BEACH

Long Beach High School:
Word Guild

MAGEE

Magee High School:
Lillian Finch

MERIDIAN

Meridian Junior College:
J. C. Brown
Stevens School Speech Clinic:
Tommie Rigdon

NATCHEZ

Natchez Public Schools:
Etoile DuBard

POPLARVILLE

Pearl River Junior College:
Anne Daniel

MISSISSIPPI—Continued

RAYMOND

Hinds Junior College:
Fred L. Brooks, Jr.

UNIVERSITY

University of Mississippi:
Joseph Baldwin
Christine Drake
Charles M. Getchell
Lucia C. Morgan
Clyde E. Reeves

NEW MEXICO

University of New Mexico:
Wayne E. Eubank

NORTH CAROLINA

CHAPEL HILL

University of North Carolina:
Norman W. Mattis
Richard P. Douthit

DAVIDSON

Davidson College:
Raymond W. Tyson
Davidson, N. C.

DURHAM

Duke University:
Joseph C. Wetherby

MARS HILL

Mars Hill College:
Gentry O. Crisp

WINSTON-SALEM

Wake Forest College:
Franklin R. Shirley

RALEIGH

North Carolina State College:
L. Swain

OHIO

COLUMBUS

Ohio State University:
Peggy J. Revels

GRANVILLE

Dension University:
Lionel Crocker

OBERLIN

Oberlin College:
Robert Gunderson

OREGON

Ontario High School:
Marvin L. Tuttle

PENNSYLVANIA

University of Pittsburg:
Otis M. Walter

SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA

1001 Main St.:
Norman Lambries
Columbia Col.:
B. Frank Lee
University of South Carolina:
Merrill G. Christophersen

GREENVILLE

Graham School:
Ethel Leach
Jr. League Speech & Hearing
Center:
Stuart I. Gilmore
Furman University:
Robert Kunkel
Sara Lowrey
Dorothy Richey

LANCASTER

409 Chesterfield Ave.:
Mrs. Ned Gregory

SPARTANBURG

Converse College
James W. Parker

TENNESSEE

CHATTANOOGA

Chattanooga Speech and Hearing
Center:
J. Dale Welsch

FOUNTAIN CITY

Central High School:
Albert Ahler

JACKSON

West Tennessee Speech and Hearing
Clinic:
Betty J. Caraway
Elaine Washington

JOHNSON CITY

E. Tennessee State College:
Chase Winfrey

KNOXVILLE

University of Tennessee:
Paul L. Soper
Rosemary Sherrod

LEBANON

214 N. Cumberland St.:
May G. Rousseau

MARYVILLE

Maryville College:
Doria B. Yeaman

TENNESSEE—Continued

MEMPHIS

Humes High School:
Helen Lochrie
Memphis State University:
Evelyn Kempe
Messick High School:
Freda Kenner
Treadwell High School:
Mary Eleanor Cooley

NASHVILLE

Belmont College:
Marjorie Bunyard
Susan Estes
David Lipscomb College:
Donald P. Garner
Vanderbilt University:
K. W. Pauli
Joseph E. Wright

TEXAS

ABILENE

Abilene Christian:
Fred Barton
Rex B. Kyker
Hardin Simmons University:
Emogene Emery

AMARILLO

Senior High School:
Mrs. N. N. Whitworth

AUSTIN

University of Texas:
Eva B. Currie
Mac R. Moseley
L. Bruce Roach
Thomas A. Rouse
Howard W. Townsend
Jesse J. Villarreal

BEAUMONT

Lamar State Col. of Tech.:
Arnold Anderson
Ted Skinner

BELTON

Mary Hardin Baylor:
Norman P. Crawford
M. Daniel McLallen

BROWNWOOD

Howard Payne Univ.:
McDonald Held
Stark McQuain

CANYON

West Texas State College:
Crannell Tolliver

TEXAS—Continued
COLLEGE STATION
*Texas Agricultural & Mechanical
College:*
Lee J. Martin

DALLAS
Southern Methodist University:
Edyth Renshaw

DENTON
Texas State College for Women:
Earl C. Bryan

FORT WORTH
Texas Wesleyan College:
H. B. Brous

HOUSTON
Houston Speech & Hearing Center:
Tina E. Bangs
University of Houston:
Genevieve Arnold
Stanley K. Hamilton
William Kilgarlin
Auley Luke
Don Streeter
Patrick Welch
R. T. Yelkin

KINGSVILLE
Texas College of Arts & Industry:
Jack P. Clark

LUBBOCK
Texas Technological College:
James E. Brennan
Bernard A. Landes
P. Merville Larson
Annah Jo Pendleton

MIDLAND
1111 W. III. St.:
Verna Harris

NACOGDOCHES
Stephen F. Austin State College:
Robert B. Capel

PASADENA
210 W. Broadway:
Nina A. Uerser

SAN MARCOS
*Southwest Texas State Teachers
College:*
Elton Abernathy
Bill Dibrell

TEXAS—Continued
SHERMAN
Austin Col.:
Paul Beardsley

SEQUIN
Texas Lutheran College:
Gene Reynolds

WACO
Baylor University:
Chloe Armstrong
Mary A. Booras
Glenn R. Capp
Mrs. G. R. Capp
Nancy J. Fry
Carolyn J. Rohrman
Lola Walker

WICHITA FALLS
Midwestern University:
Jennie L. Hindman
Fred Tewell

VIRGINIA

CHARLOTTESVILLE
University of Virginia:
J. Jeffery Auer
Joe Blanton
Helen Burr
Robert C. Jeffrey
Carolyne Khuri
G. Robert Hopper
George P. Wilson, Jr.

HAMPTON
Hampton Institute:
William Kearney

LEXINGTON
Box 694:
James W. Pence, Jr.

PETERSBURG
Virginia State College:
Bernardill F. Dabney

RICHMOND
University of Richmond:
Bert Bradley

WARWICK
726 Nansemond Dr.
Robert Schlitt

WILLIAMSBURG
College of William & Mary:
Donald L. McConkey

OFFICERS OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS — 1957-1958

ALABAMA

President.....Mrs. Robert I. Schwartz, 17 Winthrop, Birmingham
 First Vice-President.....Vacant
 Second Vice-President.....Dorothy Walker, Shades Valley High School,
 Birmingham
 Third Vice-President.....Loretta Brown, Anniston Elementary Schools, Anniston
 Secretary-Treasurer.....Dr. Andrew Kochman, Alabama College

ARKANSAS

Officers not reported 1957-1958

FLORIDA

President.....Lena McClure, Lee Junior High, Miami
 First Vice-President.....Jack Benson, University of Miami
 Second Vice-President.....Paul Davey, Florida State University
 Secretary-Treasurer.....L. L. Schendel, Florida State University
 Editor.....McKenzie Buck, University of Florida

GEORGIA

President.....Hilda Dyches, Georgia State College of Business Administration
 First Vice-President.....James Sligh, Murphy High School, Atlanta
 Second Vice-President.....Stanley Ainsworth, University of Georgia
 Third Vice-President.....Virginia Baird, Junior League School for Speech Correc
 Third Vice-President.....Virginia Baird, Junior League School for
 Speech Correction
 Secretary-Treasurer.....Glenn W. Rainey, Georgia Institute of Technology

KENTUCKY

President.....Dr. Charles McGlon, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
 Vice-President.....Mrs. Gladys Greathouse, Asbury College
 Secretary-Treasurer.....Mrs. Thelma Beeler

LOUISIANA

President.....Roy D. Murphy, Southwestern Louisiana Institute
 First Vice-President.....James W. Parkerson, Northeast State College
 Second Vice-President.....Nell Grigg, Winnfield High School, Winnfield
 Executive Secretary.....Paul Pennington, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute

MISSISSIPPI

President.....Dr. Paul D. Brandes, Mississippi Southern College
 Vice-President.....Mrs. Mildred Arnett, Columbus
 Secretary-Treasurer.....Sue Longest, Provine High School, Jackson

NORTH CAROLINA

President.....Meredith N. Posey, East Carolina College
 Vice-President.....Mrs. Dabney White, Cerebral Palsy School, Greensboro
 Executive Secretary.....Gilbert S. Ballance, Central High School, Charlotte

SOUTH CAROLINA**Officers not reported 1957-58****TENNESSEE****Officers not reported 1957-58****TEXAS****Officers not reported 1957-58****VIRGINIA****Officers not reported 1957-58**

